

**THE TEXT IS FLY
WITHIN THE BOOK
ONLY**

**This book is with
tight
Binding**

TEXT CUT BOOK

909 A55s

Andrews \$2.00
Seventy Centuries
of History 10075
Acc. No. 05

909 A55s

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

KANSAS CITY, MO PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0144236 6

SEVENTY CENTURIES OF HISTORY

As Told by the Great Historians

COMPILED AND EDITED BY

ALICE E. ANDREWS

Originator and Co-Editor of *Twelve Centuries of English Poetry and Prose*
and *Three Centuries of American Poetry and Prose*



BOSTON

CHAPMAN & GRIMES

Mount Vernon Press

Copyright 1936 by CHAPMAN & GRIMES

All Rights Reserved

Printed in the United States of America

PREFACE

Although I had specialized in history in college and graduate work, my opportunity came to teach senior English in high school.

In urging enrollment pupils to take history, I discovered that it was not a popular subject. Yet our teachers of social studies were of the best. Statistics seemed to show that only one pupil in three studies ancient history.

So interested was I in the problem, that when, after an interval of eight years, I resumed teaching, it was to teach ancient and medieval history to high school freshmen. I came to agree with what a Dean of Girls said, "Pupils will choose Latin or mathematics in preference to history, and for my part I believe I should feel as they do if I had to study the textbook they use." Yet the textbook used was one of the best. Dr. Kilpatrick, when asked at a round table discussion "How could one use the project method in a lesson on the Gothic invasion of Italy?" answered, "Well, in the first place you haven't the right textbook."

A detective story told in one paragraph would be dull. Are not our history textbooks usually mere outlines? We try to teach the poor pupil everything that ever happened. How can such a medley be interesting?

This book is an attempt to subordinate much, in order that outstanding events may be told somewhat in detail.

One teacher will miss one fact, another will miss another. Some will think the English too difficult. To be sure, pupils will have to guess at some words, and look up others; in some cases bright pupils or the teacher will have to be called on for aid. But on the other hand, most of the authors quoted are masters of the English language, and write simply, clearly, and vividly.

In these excerpts, marks of omission, which would merely confuse the pupil, usually have been omitted. Occasionally a name has been substituted for a pronoun, or vice versa. In a few cases we have simplified a word or a group of words; but every effort has been taken to avoid misinterpreting the historian. We

omit pictures as they seem so often to interrupt the story; pupils enjoy bringing them to class, and now-a-days movies are sometimes possible.

If pupils can only realize how interesting great histories often are, perhaps they will dip deeper into the works from which these chapters are mere samples, and will learn that all humanity is one.

Astronomers agree that the solar system is travelling at about 750 miles a minute. Dr. Atwood, President of Clark University once said, "If we were on a train going at a terrific speed we knew not whither, should we not be *friends?*" Burns sang five generations ago:

It's coming yet for a'that
That man to man the warld o'er
Shall brothers be for a'that.

We are learning that we all stand or fall together. But if we are to be a real brotherhood, we must have sympathy; and sympathy comes from knowledge. We must know the aims, ambitions, mistakes, failures and sorrows of mankind—and that we learn from history.

I wish to thank Miss Helen Starr of the James Jerome Hill Reference Library, and her assistants, Miss Rugg, Miss Heilmaier, Miss Humphrey; and Mrs. Jennings of the St. Paul Public Library, and her assistants, Miss Owens, Miss Smith, and Mrs. Loehr. All these have made my work a pleasure.

I wish also to extend my grateful thanks to the publishers who have so generously and kindly allowed the use of material copyrighted by them. Especially is acknowledgment due to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, for their exceedingly courteous consent to our printing quotations from the works of the learned French archeologist, Sir Gaston Maspero, D. C. L.

The last sentence of note 31 on page 16 should be omitted as it is no longer wholly true.

A. E. A.

INTRODUCTORY

The word "history" is really a form of the word "story." It is the story of all that we know of man and his deeds.

The earth, the home of man, seems to us a very great planet. You have already learned a great deal about its size and its motions as it turns on its axis every twenty-four hours and as it whirls around the sun every year.

You have also learned about the solar system—about the planets that revolve about the sun—Mercury, Venus, Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and the planet Pluto discovered in 1930, which is estimated to be 3,800,000,000 miles from the sun. So you know how large the solar system *really* is.

But when we consider the size of the universe—that is all the sky space we can see or imagine—and learn that there are millions of other stars, we begin to understand how great the universe is and how small in comparison is the solar system. Some astronomer has said that if we let the Mississippi valley represent the universe, we should have to let an orange represent the solar system. Mr. H. G. Wells tells us that if the earth were the size of a walnut, the sun would be nine feet in diameter 323 yards away, and that *on that same scale* the nearest fixed star (a star so far away that it seems never to move) would be 40,000 miles away. To learn all about such things we should have to study astronomy.

We learn about the age of the earth by studying the rocks, or geology. "Estimates of the age of the oldest rocks by geologists and astronomers starting from different standpoints have varied between 1,600,000,000 and 25,000,000 years. The lowest estimate was made by Lord Kelvin in 1867. Professor Huxley guessed at 400,000,000 years. . . . For ages that stagger the imagination this earth spun hot and lifeless, and again for ages of equal vastness it held no life above the level of the animalculae in a drop of ditchwater."¹

All these facts are so wonderful that we cannot realize them

¹ By the kind permission of Mr. H. G. Wells, we print the summary above of part of page 4, and this quotation from pages 13 and 15 of *The Outline of History*, Volume I. Special topics: Early Plant Life; Early Animals.

at all. But we know that the mind of an ant cannot grasp trigonometry and that very possibly the mind of man cannot comprehend God and the universe. When we wonder and doubt we can only believe with Tennyson that:

Through the ages one unceasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns.

and with Shakespeare:

There's a divinity that shapes our ends.
Rough-hew them how we will.

Historical knowledge has increased very rapidly during these last hundred years. Not so very long ago² people believed that the earth and man were created in 4004 B. C. Now scholars believe that man first appeared very possibly 100,000 or 800,000 or a million years ago. A modern theory, believed by most scientists, holds that man in the course of many centuries was developed from the ape. Dr. E. B. Tylor after showing the differences between man and gorilla says: "These anatomical distinctions are undoubtedly of great moment and it is an interesting question whether they suffice to place man in a zoological order by himself."

No animal has been known to sharpen a stone into a fist-hatchet or to make a needle out of bone. When we find such things we know they must have been made by man. In the lakes of Switzerland and in those of some other countries there have been found piles, which, by the remains found in the peat in which they are buried, have been proved to be foundations of ancient houses. In the ancient caves of northern Spain and southern France have

² At the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837, the estimates of Archbishop Usher were generally accepted.

Special topics: The Java Man, The Heidelberg Man, The Piltdown Skull, The Neanderthal Man, The Four Ice Ages, etc.

In the article "Anthropology" in the Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) Dr. Tylor states that the largest cranium of a gorilla contains but $34\frac{1}{2}$ cubic inches, while the smallest cranium of man contains 63 cubic inches, and that the gorilla's arm is one-sixth longer than the spine, while man's arm is one-fifth shorter than the spine. We print this and other quotations from, and references to the Encyclopedia Britannica by kind permission of The Encyclopedia Britannica Company.

been found drawings of animals. From all these pre-historic sources scholars have divided the history of early man into three divisions, that of the paleolithic or old stone age, when man made very roughly chipped tools; the middle stone age when he made better stone implements, carved ivory, and could draw; and the neolithic or late stone age when he advanced still further. More remains may be found, however, and what we think we know today about early man, may in a few years be proved to be very incomplete. We shall therefore begin with the story of civilized man. This will take us first to ancient Egypt and Babylonia.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
INTRODUCTORY	v
I. ANCIENT EGYPT (<i>Maspero</i>)	1
II. BABYLONIA (<i>Maspero</i>)	17
III. ANCIENT SYRIA (<i>Maspero</i>)	30
IV. THE HEBREWS OR ISRAELITES (<i>Maspero</i>)	34
V. THE PHOENICIANS (<i>Maspero</i>)	38
VI. THE HITTITES (<i>Maspero</i>)	43
VII. ASSYRIA (<i>Maspero</i>)	46
VIII. LATER BABYLONIA I.E. CHALDEA (<i>Maspero</i>)	56
IX. ANCIENT CHINA (a brief outline)	59
X. ANCIENT INDIA (a brief outline)	62
XI. ANCIENT PERSIA (<i>Maspero</i>)	64
XII. THE AEGEANS (a brief outline)	72
XIII. ANCIENT GREECE (<i>Grote</i>)	76
Games	77
The Delphic Oracle	78
Gods of the Greeks	79
City-states	80
Sparta	80
Athens	81
Solon	81
Kleisthenes	84
War with Persia	85
Darius's first expedition against Athens	86
Darius's second expedition against Greece	87
The battle of Marathon, 490 B.C.	89
Xerxes' expedition against Greece	92
Events at Athens	94
Thermopylae	97
The Battle of the Bay of Salamis 480 B.C.	100
(For the battle of Platea see note page 104)	
Athens after the war with Persia	104
The Confederacy of Delos	107
The Peloponnesian Wars	110
The Second Peloponnesian War	112
The Plague	115
The Peace of Nicias	117
The Sicilian Expedition, sometimes called the Third Peloponnesian War	118
(As told by <i>Thucydides</i>)	119

	(For battle of Ægospotami see note page 121)	
	The Rule of Sparta	123
	The Thirty Rule Athens	123
	The Retreat of the Ten Thousand (<i>Xenophon</i>)	126
	Socrates (<i>Plato</i>)	128
	Thebes Gains the Power	131
	Epaminondas	132
	Philip of Macedonia	134
	Demosthenes	135
	Alexander the Great	138
XIV.	ROME (<i>Mommsen</i>)	146
	The Beginnings of Rome	146
	Rome before the Punic Wars	148
	Economic Conditions	149
	The Punic Wars	150
	The First Punic War	151
	The Second Punic War	153
	(Hannibal's crossing the Alps as told by <i>Livy</i>)	154
	The Burning of Carthage (the Third Punic War)	157
	Roman Problems	163
	Government of the Provinces	163
	The Government in Rome	164
	Amusements	167
	Luxury	168
	Commerce	170
	Slavery	171
	Attempts at Reform	173
	Cato	173
	Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus	174
	Gaius Gracchus	175
	Julius Caesar	177
	The Empire (<i>Freeman and Merivale</i>)	186
	Invasions of Rome by the Goths (<i>Gibbon</i>)	193
	Alaric the Goth	196
	The Fall of Rome, 476 A.D. (<i>Gibbon</i>)	199
	Odoacer	199
	Theodoric	201
	Justinian the Great, 527-565 (<i>Gibbon</i>)	203
	Justinian's work for law	204
XV.	CHRISTIANITY (<i>George Park Fisher</i>)	206

CONTENTS

xi

XVI.	MOHAMMED, OR MAHOMET (<i>Gibbon and Duruy</i>) . . .	214
XVII.	GAUL I.E. FRANCE (<i>Guizot</i>) . . .	221
	Charlemagne (<i>Guizot and Eginhard</i>) . . .	226
XVIII.	FEUDALISM (<i>Guizot</i>) . . .	233
	Chivalry (<i>Duruy</i>) . . .	235
XIX.	BRITAIN (<i>Dr. F. J. Haverfield, Gildas, Taine, and chiefly Green</i>) . . .	238
	The Coming to Britain of the Teutons . . .	238
	The Coming of Christianity from Rome . . .	243
	The Coming of Christianity from Ireland . . .	245
	Bede . . .	246
	England Nominally United under Egbert . . .	247
	The Coming of the Danes . . .	247
	Alfred the Great . . .	249
	The Normans (<i>Green and Guizot</i>) . . .	249
	William the Conqueror Rules England (<i>Green and Freeman</i>) . . .	252
	Stephen, 1135-1154 . . .	256
	Henry II . . .	258
	Richard the Lion-hearted (<i>Coeur de Lion</i>) 1190-1199 . . .	260
	King John, 1204-1215 . . .	261
	Henry III, 1216-1272 . . .	264
	Simon de Montfort . . .	266
	The Parliament of 1265 . . .	267
	Edward I, 1272-1307 . . .	267
	Edward III, 1327-1377 . . .	270
	The Hundred Years' War . . .	270
	Cressy, 1346 . . .	270
	Calais, 1347 . . .	271
	The Black Death (probably a bubonic plague) 1349 . . .	271
	The Peasant Revolt . . .	273
	Joan of Arc . . .	274
	(For the Wars of the Roses see page 276)	
XX.	THE RENAISSANCE IN EUROPE (<i>Hallam and chiefly Symonds</i>) . . .	277
	From Caxton's <i>Mirroure of the World</i> . . .	278
	From <i>The Book of Quinte Essence</i> . . .	282
	Part of a lesson given in the School of the Palace of Charlemagne (<i>Guizot</i>) . . .	283
	Scholasticism (<i>Duruy</i>) . . .	284

The Crusades (<i>J. F. Michaud and Guizot</i>) . . .	287
The Rise of Free Cities (<i>Hendrik van Loon</i>) . . .	302
Discoveries (<i>Duruy</i>)	305
From Richard Hakluyt's <i>Voyages</i>	308
The Revival of Learning (<i>Hallam and chiefly Symonds</i>)	313
New Interest in Ancient Greek Manuscripts . . .	313
Dante and Petrarch	315
Universities	317
Books	318
Printing	321
What was the Renaissance?	323
Savonarola	326
Revival of Art	331
XXI. PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION	333
Germany in the Sixteenth Century (<i>Robertson's Life of Charles V</i>)	333
The Reformation in Germany (<i>Hausser</i>)	336
Martin Luther	336
Indulgences	339
The Diet of Worms, 1521	345
The Diet of Nuremberg, 1523	348
The Peasants' War, 1525	349
The Diet of Spire	351
(For Diet of Augsburg see page 353)	
The Reformation in Switzerland (<i>Hausser</i>) . . .	356
Ulrich Zwingli, 1484-1531	356
John Calvin, 1509-1564	356
The Reformation in France (<i>Guizot</i>)	362
The Albigenses	362
The Waldenses or Vaudois	362
The Huguenots	362
The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572	365
The Reformation in the Netherlands or the Rise of Holland (<i>Motley</i>)	377
Early heresy	378
Philip II, 1527-1598	380
The Spanish Inquisition	382
William the Silent, Prince of Orange	386
The Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648 (<i>Hausser</i>) . .	396
Christian IV of Denmark	400
Wallenstein	400
Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden	403

CONTENTS

xiii

	Cardinal Richelieu	404
	Treaty of Westphalia, 1648	405
	The Reformation in England (<i>Green</i>)	407
	John Wyclif, 1324?-1384	407
XXII.	ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS (<i>Green and Froude</i>)	412
	Henry the Seventh, 1485-1509	412
	Henry the Eighth, 1509-1547	413
	Henry VIII seeks a divorce from Catherine	414
	The Act of Supremacy, 1534	416
	The Dissolution of the Monasteries	418
	Edward VI, 1547-1553 (Lord Hertford, later Duke of Somerset, Protector)	420
	Lady Jane Grey	421
	Mary Tudor, 1553-1558	423
	Elizabeth Tudor, 1558-1603	432
	England in Elizabeth's Time	444
	Persecution of Catholics	447
	The Spanish Armada	451
	Elizabeth's Last Days	453
XXIII.	ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS (<i>Green</i>)	456
	James (VI of Scotland) I of England, 1603- 1625	456
	The Commons Remonstrate	458
	Charles the First, 1625-1649	461
	The Petition of Right, 1628	464
	The Parliament of 1629	466
	William Laud	467
	The Tyranny, 1629-1640	467
	The Star Chamber	468
	Laud and Strafford	468
	The Long Parliament, 1640-1644	470
	Charles the First is Executed, 1649	473
	The Commonwealth	474
	Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, 1653-1658	476
	The Restoration, Charles the Second, 1660- 1685	479
	James the Second, 1685-1688	483
XXIV.	WILLIAM AND MARY, 1688-1702—THE BLOODLESS REVOLUTION	488
	Index	489
	Map of Egypt, Babylonia, Etc.	Front
	Map of Greece and surrounding territory	End Papers
	Map of Italy and surrounding territory	Back
	Map of Europe	End Papers

Seventy Centuries of History

I—EGYPT

A long, low, level shore,¹ scarcely rising above the sea, a chain of vaguely defined and ever shifting lakes and marshes, then the triangular plain beyond, whose apex is thrust thirty leagues inland—this, the Delta of Egypt, has gradually been acquired from the sea, and is as it were the gift of the Nile. The Mediterranean once reached to the foot of the sandy plateau on which stand the pyramids, and formed a wide gulf where now stretches plain after plain of the Delta. . . . Some modern geologists declare that the Nile must have worked at the formation of its own estuary for at least seventy-four thousand years. . . . But even though we reduce the period, we must still admit that the Egyptians little suspected the true age of their country.

As the land rises toward the south, the fawn-colored line of the desert comes into sight. The Libyan and Arabian hills appear above the plain, draw nearer to each other, and gradually shut in the horizon until it seems as though they would unite. And there the Delta ends, and Egypt proper has begun.

It is only a strip of vegetable mould stretching north and south between regions of drought and desolation, a prolonged oasis on the banks of the river, made by the Nile, and sustained by the Nile. The whole length of the land is shut in between two ranges of hills, roughly parallel at a mean² distance of about twelve miles. During the earlier ages, the river filled all this intermediate space, and the sides of the hills, polished, worn, blackened to their very summits, still bear unmistakable traces of its action. Wasted, and shrunk within the depths of its ancient bed, the stream now makes a way through its own thick deposits of mud. The bulk of its waters keeps to the east, and constitutes the true Nile, the

¹ We quote from Sir Gaston Maspero's great works *The Dawn of Civilization* and *The Struggle of the Nations*, by kind permission of The Macmillan Company, D. Appleton, Century Company, and the S. P. C. K., London.

² average

"Great River" of the hieroglyphic³ inscriptions. A second arm flows close to the Libyan desert, here and there formed into canals, elsewhere left to follow its own course.

The Arabian hills do not form one unbroken line, but a series of mountain masses with their spurs, now approaching the river, and now withdrawing to the desert at almost regular intervals. . . . Limestone predominates throughout, white or yellowish, broken by veins of alabaster, or of red and grey sandstones. Man has broken into their sides to cut his quarries and his tombs. The plain continues to contract. At Thebes it is still ten miles wide; at the gorge of Gebelen it has almost disappeared and at Gebel Silsileh⁴ it has completely vanished. From this point, Egypt is nothing but the bed of the Nile lying between two precipitous sides of naked rock.

The ancient Egyptians never sought the source of the Nile. They imagined the whole universe to be a large box, nearly rectangular in form, whose greatest diameter was from south to north, and its least from east to west. The earth formed the bottom of the box; it was a narrow, oblong, and slightly concave floor, with Egypt in its center. The sky stretched over it like an iron ceiling. Since this ceiling could not remain in mid-air without support, four columns, or rather four forked trunks of trees were supposed to uphold it. But it was doubtless feared lest some tempest should overturn them, for they were superseded by four lofty peaks, rising at the four cardinal points, and connected by a continuous chain of mountains.

The Nile was said to have its source in Paradise. Sometimes it carried down from its celestial sources branches and fruits unlike any to be found on earth. Every year, towards the middle of June, Isis, mourning for Osiris, let fall into it one of the tears which she

³ Special topics: "Hieroglyphics," "The Egyptian Alphabet," "Papyrus," "The Rosetta Stone," and "Champollion," who first deciphered it in 1822. From the time he was eleven he had wanted to learn to read the ancient Egyptian writing.

⁴ Just north of the modern Assuan, the dam at the First Cataract. The Delta and the land of Egypt up to this First Cataract includes, according to Breasted, only 10,000 square miles or less than one eighth of Minnesota.

shed over her brother, and thereupon the river swelled and descended upon earth. The melting of the snows and the excessive spring rains having suddenly swollen the torrents which rise in the central plateau of Abyssinia, the Nile rolls impetuously toward the plain. Its waters reach Khartum in the middle of May. From that time the height of the Nile increases rapidly day by day. The river constantly reinforced by floods following one upon another from the Great Lakes of central Africa and from Abyssinia, rises in furious bounds, and would become a devastating torrent were its rage not checked by the Nubian cataracts. Here six basins, one above another, in which the water collects, check its course, and permit it to flow thence only as a partially filtered and moderated stream. It is signalled at Syene towards the 8th of June, at Cairo by the 17th to the 20th, and there its birth is officially celebrated during the "Night of the Drop." Two days later it reaches the Delta, just in time to save the country from drought and sterility. Egypt, burnt up by the Khamsin, a west wind blowing continuously for fifty days, seems nothing more than an extension of the desert. The trees are covered and choked by a layer of grey dust. . . . The plain lies panting in the sun—naked, dusty, and ashen—scored with intersecting cracks⁵ as far as the eye can see. The river reaches its full height towards the 15th of July; but the dykes which confine it, and the barriers constructed across the mouths of canals, still prevent it from overflowing. The Nile must be considered high enough to submerge the land adequately before it is set free. The ancient Egyptians measured its height by cubits of twenty-one and a quarter inches. At fourteen cubits, they pronounced it an excellent Nile; below thirteen, or above fifteen, it was accounted insufficient or excessive, and in either case meant famine, and perhaps pestilence at hand. To this day the natives watch its advance with the same anxious eagerness; and from the 3rd of July, public criers, walking the streets of Cairo, announce each morning what progress it has made since evening. . . . It is generally between the 1st and 16th of July that it is decided to

⁵ Irrigation canals.

break through the dykes. When that proceeding has been solemnly accomplished in state, the flood still takes several days to fill the canals, and afterwards spreads over the low lands, advancing little by little to the very edge of the desert. Egypt is then one sheet of turbid water spreading between two lines of rock and sand, flecked with green and black spots where there are towns or where the ground rises, and divided into irregular compartments by raised roads connecting the villages. For about eight days it remains stationary, and then begins to fall imperceptibly, and by December the river has completely retired to the limits of its bed. Everything is dependent upon the river:—the soil, the produce of the soil, the species of animals it bears, the birds which it feeds; and hence it was the Egyptians placed the river among their gods.

The Egyptians called themselves *Romitû*, *Rotû*, and their country *Qimit*, the black land. Whence came they? How far off in time are we to carry back the date of their arrival? The oldest monuments hitherto known scarcely transport us further than six thousand years, yet they are of an art so fine, so well determined in its main outlines, and reveal so ingeniously combined a system of administration, government, and religion, that we infer a long past of accumulated centuries behind them. It must always be difficult to estimate exactly the length of time needful for a race as gifted as were the ancient Egyptians to rise from barbarism into a high degree of culture. Nevertheless, I do not think that we shall be misled in granting them forty or fifty centuries wherein to bring so complicated an achievement to a successful issue, and in placing their first appearance at eight or ten thousand years before our era.⁶

The incredible number of religious scenes to be found on the ancient monuments of Egypt is striking. One would think that the country had been inhabited for the most part by gods. The sky, the earth, the stars, the sun, the Nile, were so many breathing and thinking beings. Some said that the sky was the Great Horus,

⁶ It is quite possible that civilization may have existed in other parts of the earth as early or earlier than in Egypt; but we study Egypt first because we find there many more ancient relics which the dry, hot, cliffs have preserved.

—the sparrow-hawk of mottled plumage, which hovers in highest air, and whose gaze embraces the whole field of creation. The fiery disk Atonû, by which the sun revealed himself to men, was a living god called Râ, as was also the planet itself. Where the sky was regarded as Horus, Râ formed the right eye of the divine face; when Horus opened his eyelids in the morning, he made the dawn and day; when he closed them in the evening, the dusk and night were at hand. Where the sky was looked upon as a goddess, Râ was considered as her son. Osiris of the Delta was an incarnation of the fertilizing and life-sustaining Nile. The earth in general, as distinguished from the sky was represented as a man; by Ptah⁷ at Memphis, and by Amon at Thebes.

Gods, like men, might be resolved into at least two elements, soul and body; but in Egypt, the conception of the soul varied in different times and in different schools. It might be an insect—butterfly, bee, or bird—or the black shadow—khaîbît—that is attached to every body, but which death sets free, and which thenceforward leads an independent existence, so that it can move about at will, and go out into the open sunlight. Finally, it might be a kind of light shadow, a “double”—ka—reproducing in detail the complete image of the object or the person to whom it belonged.⁸ As to the body, no one was ignorant of its natural fate. It quickly fell to decay, and a few years sufficed to reduce it to a skeleton. As for the skeleton, in the lapse of centuries that too became a mere train of dust, to be blown away by the first breath of wind. The soul might have a longer career and fuller fortunes, but these were believed to be dependent upon those of the body.⁹

If there were hills at hand, thither the mummied dead were borne, partly from custom, partly because the dryness of the air and of the soil offered them a further chance of preservation. In districts of the Delta where the hills were so distant as to make it

⁷ Compare, Ruskin's *Ethics of the Dust*.

⁸ Some scholars say it was not so much a shadow as a guiding spirit.

⁹ The Egyptians, therefore, did all they could to preserve the body. Special topics: “Mummies”; “The Book of the Dead.”

very costly to reach them, advantage was taken of the smallest sandy islet rising above the marshes, and there a cemetery was founded. Where this resource failed, the mummy was fearlessly entrusted to the soil itself, but only after being placed within a sarcophagus of hard stone, whose lid and trough, hermetically fastened together with cement, prevented the penetration of any moisture. The soul followed the body to the tomb, and there dwelt with it. By day the double¹⁰ remained concealed within the tomb. Its organs needed nourishment as formerly did those of its body and of itself it possessed nothing "but hunger for food, thirst for drink," Want and misery drove it from its retreat, and flung it back among the living. It prowled like a marauder about the fields and villages picking up and greedily devouring whatever it might find on the ground. One way there was, and one only, for the relatives of the dead to escape these visitations from the double, and this lay in taking to the tomb all the various provisions of which the double stood in need, and for which it visited their dwellings. Some of the wealthy class had their tombs cut out of the mountain-side, but the majority preferred an isolated tomb, a "mastaba" comprising a chapel above ground, a shaft, and some subterranean vaults. In order to ensure that the promised gifts, offered in substance on the day of burial, should be maintained throughout the centuries, the relatives not only pictured them upon the chapel walls, but represented in addition the lands which produced them, and the labor which contributed to their production. On one side we see ploughing, sowing, reaping, the carrying of the corn, the storing of the grain, the fattening of the poultry, and the driving of the cattle. A little further on, workmen of all description are engaged in their several trades; shoemakers ply the awl, glassmakers blow through their tubes, metal founders watch over their smelting-pots, carpenters hew down trees and build a ship; groups of women weave or spin under the eye of a frowning taskmaster, who seems impatient of their chatter. Did the double in his hunger desire meat? He might choose from the

¹⁰ or Ka, or soul.

pictures on the wall the animal that pleased him best; he might follow the course of its life, from its birth in the meadows to the slaughter-house and the kitchen, and might satisfy his hunger with its flesh. The double saw himself represented in the paintings as hunting, and to the hunt he went; he was painted eating and drinking with his wife, and he ate and drank with her; the pictured ploughing, harvesting, and gathering into barns, thus became to him actual realities. In fine, this painted world of men and things represented on the wall was quickened by the same life which animated the double, upon whom it all depended; the *picture* of a meal or of a slave was perhaps that which best suited the *shade* of guest or of master.

Even today, when we enter one of these decorated chapels, the idea of death scarcely presents itself: we have rather the impression of being in some old-world house, to which the master may at any moment return. We see him portrayed everywhere upon the walls, followed by his servants, and surrounded by everything which made his earthly life enjoyable. One or two statues of him stand at the end of the room, in constant readiness to receive offerings. Should these statues be accidentally removed, others hidden in the thickness of the wall, are there to replace them. The statues furnish in their modelling a more correct idea of the deceased than his mummy, disfigured as it was by the work of the embalmers; they were also less easily destroyed, and any number could be made at will. Hence arose the really incredible number of statues sometimes hidden away in the same tomb. These sustainers or imperishable bodies of the double were multiplied so as to insure for him a practical immortality; and the care with which they were shut into a secure hiding-place, increased their chances of preservation. All the same, no precaution was neglected that could save a mummy from destruction. The shaft leading to it descended to an average depth of forty or fifty feet, but sometimes it reached, and even exceeded a hundred feet.

During the course of centuries, the ever-increasing number of tombs at length formed an almost uninterrupted chain of burying-

places on the table-land. At Gizeh they follow a symmetrical plan, and line the sides of regular roads;¹¹ at Saqqâra they are scattered about on the surface of the ground, in some places sparsely, in others huddled confusedly together. Everywhere the tombs are rich in inscriptions, statues, and painted or sculptured scenes, each revealing some characteristic custom, or some detail of contemporary civilization. From the Egypt of these cemeteries, the Egypt of the Memphite dynasties¹² gradually takes new life, and reappears in the full daylight of history. Nobles and fellahs,¹³ soldiers and priests, scribes and craftsmen,—the whole nation lives anew before us; each with his manners, his dress, his daily round of occupations and pleasures. It is a perfect picture, and although in places the drawing is defaced and the color dimmed, yet these may be restored with no great difficulty, and with almost absolute certainty.¹⁴

The king stands out boldly in the foreground, and his tall figure towers over all else. Khûfûi, the Kheops of the Greeks, reigned twenty-three years. Scores of other Pharaohs had done as much or more, on whom no one bestowed a thought a century after their death, and Kheops would have succumbed to the same indifference had he not forcibly attracted the continuous attention of posterity by the immensity of his tomb.¹⁵ The Egyptians measured the magnificence of Kheops by the dimensions of his pyramid, and all nations having followed this example, Kheops has continued to be one of the three or four names of former times which sound familiar to our ears. The pyramid when completed had a height of 476 feet on a base of 764 feet square; but the decaying influence of time has reduced these dimensions to 450 and 730 feet

¹¹ They extend southward some sixty miles.

¹² A dynasty is a succession of kings from one family. The Fourth Dynasty, to which Kheops belonged, ruled at Memphis, probably about 2900–2750 B. C.

¹³ peasants.

¹⁴ From such pictures and inscriptions we find out much about the ancient Egyptians. We learn that they divided the year into twelve months, but that they had no year one from which to count and therefore named years for events; for example "The year of fighting and smiting the people of Lower Egypt," or "The second year of the reign of Thutmosis I."

¹⁵ Special topic: "The Great Pyramid."

respectively. Its polished facing was so subtilely jointed that one would have said that it was a single slab from top to bottom.

Khefren, Cheops' second son, who succeeded to the throne, erected temples and a gigantic pyramid, like his father. He placed it some 394 feet to the southwest of that of Kheops; and called it Uîrû, the Great. It is, however, smaller than its neighbor, and attains a height of only 443 feet, but at a distance the difference in height disappears, and many travellers have thus been led to attribute the same elevation to the two.

In order to understand the manner in which the government of Egypt was conducted, we should never forget that the world was still ignorant of the use of money, and that gold, silver, and copper, however abundant we may suppose them to have been, were mere articles of exchange like the most common products of Egyptian soil. The Pharaoh's receipts were in kind, and it was in kind that he paid his servants for their labor; cattle, cereals, fermented drinks, oils, stuffs, common or precious metals,—“all that the heavens give, all that the earth produces, all that the Nile brings from its mysterious sources,” constituted the coinage in which his subjects paid him their contributions, and which he passed on to his vassals by way of salary. As the products in which the taxes were paid took various forms, it was necessary to have an infinite variety of special agents and suitable places to receive it; herdsman and sheds for the oxen, measurers and granaries for the grain, butlers and cellarers for the wine, beer, and oils. The product of the tax, while awaiting redistribution, could only be kept from deteriorating in value by incessant labor, in which a score of different classes of clerks and workmen all took part, according to their trades.

Thutmosis I¹⁶ of the Eighteenth Dynasty (about 1600–1350 B. C.), brought with him on ascending the throne the spirit of the younger generation, who, born shortly after the deliverance from the Hyksos¹⁷ had grown up in the peaceful days of Amenothès (or

¹⁶ or Thothmes I. Egyptian writing had no vowels.

¹⁷ The Hyksos or Shepherds were foreign invaders who may have ruled Egypt several hundred years. Little is known about them.

Amenhotep) I. To this younger race Africa no longer offered a sufficiently wide or attractive field. What remained to be conquered in that direction was scarcely worth the trouble of reducing to a province or of annexing as a colony. The isolation of the kingdoms of the ancient world was at an end; the conflict of the nations was about to begin. . . .

With the exception of a few merchants or adventurers, no one from Thebes to Memphis had any other idea of Asia than that which could be gathered from the scattered notices of it in the semi-historical romances of the preceding age.

Thûtmosis succeeded in reaching on his first expedition a limit which none of his successors was able to surpass, and the road taken by him in this campaign—from Gaza to Megiddo, from Megiddo to Qodshû, from Qodshû to Carchemish—was that which was followed henceforward by the Egyptian troops in all their expeditions to the Euphrates¹⁸. . . . He re-entered Thebes with immense booty.

Since the invasion of the Hyksos, a new element had been incorporated into the army. The horse, when once introduced into Egypt, soon became fairly adapted to its environment. The first chariots were, like the horses, of foreign origin, but when built by Egyptian workmen they soon became more elegant, if not stronger, than their models. Lightness was the quality chiefly aimed at; and at length the weight was so reduced that it was possible for a man to carry his chariot on his shoulders without fatigue. The materials for them were on this account limited to oak or ash and leather; metal, whether gold or silver, iron or bronze, being used but sparingly, and then only for purposes of ornamentation.

The results of the first expedition of Thûtmosis I were such that he never again, it would seem, found it necessary during the remainder of his life to pass the isthmus. Northern Syria, it is true, did not remain long under tribute, if indeed it paid any at all after the departure of the Egyptians, but the southern part of the

¹⁸ See the description of that road on pages 30 to 32.

country, feeling itself in the grip of the new master, accepted its defeat: Gaza became the headquarters of a garrison which secured the door of Asia for future invasion; and Pharaoh, freed from anxiety in this quarter, gave his whole time to the consolidation of his power in Ethiopia.

The earlier kings of the XVIIIth dynasty had chosen for their last resting-place a spot on the left bank of the Nile at Thebes. Probably, after the burial of Amenothès, the space was fully occupied, for Thûtmosis I had to seek his burying-ground some way up the ravine. Here Thûtmosis laid the foundation of a building which was destined to be unique in the world.¹⁹ He scarcely did more than begin this magnificent building, but his mummy was buried in it with great pomp, to remain there until a period of disturbance and general insecurity obliged those in charge of the necropolis to remove the body, together with those of his family, to some securer hiding place.

When Thûtmosis III²⁰ was approaching manhood, his aunt the queen, Hâtshopsîtû, instead of abdicating in his favor, associated him with herself somewhat in the government. She was forced to yield him precedence in those religious ceremonies which could be performed by a man only; but for the most part she obliged him to remain in the background and take a secondary place beside her. He was about twenty-five years of age when her death left him sole ruler; and he immediately revenged himself for the long repression he had undergone, by endeavoring to destroy the very remembrance of her whom he regarded as a usurper. Every portrait of her that he could deface without exposing himself to being accused of sacrilege was cut away, and he substituted for her name either that of Thûtmosis I or of Thûtmosis II. Hâtshopsîtû had been averse to war; by the end of her life she had lost nearly all that her father had gained in Syria. Thûtmosis III therefore waged a war with Syria, and caused a long list of the vanquished to be engraved on the walls of the temple he was

¹⁹ the Temple of Karnak.

²⁰ second son of Thûtmosis I.

building at Karnak, thus affording the good people of Thebes an opportunity for the first time of reading on the monuments the titles of the king's Syrian subjects written in hieroglyphics.

Amenothès III²¹ sought for a site for a tomb where he would have ample room to display his magnificence, and found what he desired at the further end of the valley which opens out behind the village of Qûrnah. Here, an hour's journey from the bank of the Nile, he cut for himself a magnificent rock-tomb with galleries, halls, and deep pits, the walls being decorated with representations of the Voyage of the Sun. Two colossal statues still maintain their positions on each side of the entrance to the chapel, with their faces toward the east. They are each formed of a single block of red breccia from Syene, and are fifty-three feet high, but the more northerly one was shattered in the earthquake which completed the ruin of Thebes in 27 B. C. Like his predecessors, Amenothès III had taken, while still very young, wives from among his own family, but neither these ties, nor his numerous diplomatic alliances with foreign princesses, were enough for him. He took as wife Tîi, the daughter of Iûîa and his wife Tûîa, and raised her to the position of queen.

He had several sons; but the one who succeeded him, and who, like him, was named Amenothès (IV) (or Akhnaton c. 1350 B. C.), was the most paradoxical of all the Egyptian sovereigns of ancient times.²² Tîi certainly for several years possessed the power of regent, and gave a definite Oriental impress to her son's religious policy. No outward changes were made at first. The devotion of Amenothès IV to the invincible Disk,²³ however, soon began to assert itself. Thebes had belonged to Amon so long that the king could never hope to bring it to regard Atonû as anything but a being of inferior rank. A newly promoted god demanded a new city; Amenothès, therefore, made selection of a broad plain,²⁴ ex-

²¹ great-grandson of Thûtmosis III.

²² See *The Life and Times of Akhnaton* by A. E. P. Weigall. Akhnaton seems to come very near, at least, to substituting *one* God for the many Egyptian gods.

²³ the sun, Atonu.

²⁴ Tell-el Amarna, where in 1887 several hundred writings were found.

tending on the right bank of the Nile, to which he removed with all his court about the fourth or fifth year of his reign. Amenôthes built there a palace for himself and a temple for his god. The temple covered an immense area. The remains show that it was built of white limestone, of fine quality, but that it was almost devoid of ornament. The palace was built of brick; it was approached by a colossal gateway, and contained vast halls, interspersed with small apartments for the accommodation of the household, and storehouses for the necessary provisions, besides gardens which had been hastily planted with rare shrubs and sycamores. Fragments of furniture and of the roughest of the utensils contained in the different chambers are still unearthed from among the heaps of rubbish, and the cellars especially are full of potsherds and cracked jars, on which we can still see written an indication of the reign and the year when the wine they once contained was made. Atonû was "the good god who rejoices in truth, the lord of the solar course, the lord of the disk, the lord of heaven, the lord of earth, the living disk which lights up the two worlds." In place of the name Amenôthes, "he to whom Amon is united," the king assumed after a time the name of Khûniationû (or Akhnaton) "the Glory of the Disk," and all the members of his family, as well as his adherents at court, whose names contained the name Amen or Amon soon followed his example. Khûniationû died young about the XVIIIth year of his reign. He was buried in the depths of a ravine in the mountainside to the east of the town, and his tomb remained unknown till within the last few years.

Khûniationû left no son to succeed him; two of his sons-in-law successively occupied the throne—Sâakerî, who had married his eldest daughter Marîtatônû, and Tutankhamon,²⁵ the husband of Ankhnasaton. The first had been associated in the sovereignty by his father-in-law; he showed himself a zealous partisan of the

²⁵ See the accounts in the "Geographic," and other magazines, of the discovery of King Tut's tomb.

"Disk," and he continued to reside in the new capital during the few years of his sole reign. The second son-in-law returned to the religion of Amon, and his wife, abjuring the creed of her father, changed her name from Ankhnasaton to that of Ankhnasamon. Her husband abandoned Khûitatonû at the end of two or three years, and after his departure the town fell into decadence as quickly as it had arisen.

Ramses I,²⁶ desirous of obliterating all traces of the misfortunes lately brought about by the changes effected by the heretic king, had contemplated building at Karnak, in front of the pylon of Amenothès III, an enormous hall for the ceremonies connected with the cult of Amon, where the immense numbers of priests and worshippers at festival times could be accommodated without inconvenience. It devolved on his son Seti I to carry out what had been merely an ambitious dream of his father's. We long to know who was the architect possessed of such confidence in his powers that he ventured to design, and was able to carry out, this almost superhuman undertaking. His name would be held up to almost universal admiration beside those of the greatest masters that we are familiar with, for no one in Greece or Italy has left us any work which surpasses it, or which with such simple means could produce a similar impression of boldness and immensity. It is almost impossible to convey by words, to those who have not seen it, the impression which it makes on the spectator.²⁷

At Abydos, also, Seti I built a temple. It must be regarded as a vast funerary chapel, and no one who has studied the religion of Egypt can entertain a doubt as to its purpose. Abydos was the place where the dead assembled before passing into the other world. It was here at the mouth of the "Cleft," that they received the provisions and offerings of their relatives and friends who remained on this earth. As the dead flocked hither from all parts of the world, they collected around the tomb of Osiris, and there waited till the moment came to embark on the Boat of the Sun.

²⁶ of the Nineteenth Dynasty (c. 1350-1205 B. C.).

²⁷ Special topic: The Temple of Karnak.

Seti did not wish his soul to associate with those of the common crowd of his vassals, and prepared this temple for himself, as a separate resting-place, close to the mouth of Hades. After having dwelt within it for a short time subsequent to his funeral, his soul could repair thither whenever it desired, certain of always finding within it the incense and nourishment of which it stood in need.

Seti's successor was his second son, Ramses II.²⁸ "From the time I was in the egg," Ramses writes later on, "the great ones sniffed the earth before me; when I attained to the rank of eldest son and heir upon the throne, I dealt with affairs, I commanded as chief the foot soldiers and the chariots. My father having appeared before the people, when I was a very little boy in his arms, said to me: 'I shall have him crowned king, that I may see him in all his splendor while I am still on this earth!'"²⁹ Seti, however, did not in any sense retire; if he permitted Ramses to adopt the insignia of royalty, he still remained to the day of his death the principal State official, and he reckoned all the years of this dual sovereignty as those of his sole reign.

Ramses was the royal builder *par excellence*, and we may say without fear of contradiction that, from the second cataract to the mouths of the Nile, there is scarcely an edifice on whose ruins we do not find his name. In Nubia, where the desert approaches close to the Nile, he confined himself to cutting in the solid rock the monuments, which for want of space, he could not build in the open. He wished to find a site where he would be without a rival, and to this end he transformed the cliff at Abu Simbel into a monument of his greatness. At the spot where the beach ends at the point of the promontory, sit four colossi, with their feet nearly touching the water, their backs leaning against a sloping wall of rock. One of the colossi is broken; the others rise to the height of 63 feet, and appear to look across the Nile. The crown surmounts their foreheads, and the two ends of the head-dress fall behind their ears; their features are of a noble type, calm and serious; the nose slightly aquiline, the under-lip projecting above a square

²⁸ c. 1292-1225 B. C.

²⁹ From an inscription in the temple of Seti I at Abydos.

but rather heavy chin. Of such a type we may picture Ramses, after the conclusion of the peace with the Khati,³⁰ in the full vigor of his manhood and at the height of his power.

These were merely the principal monuments put up by Ramses II at Thebes during the sixty-seven years of his rule. It would seem as if in his opinion the glory of Egypt began with him, or at least with his father. He became the subject of legend almost before he had closed his eyes upon the world. Popular fancy made him the Pharaoh of Pharaohs—the embodiment of all preceding monarchs.

Egypt, nevertheless, was proceeding at a quick pace, toward its downfall. No sooner had this monarch disappeared, than it began to break up, and anarchy reigned supreme from one end of the Nile valley to the other. Her own territory itself was threatened, and her own well-being was in question; she was compelled to consider, not how to rule other tribes, great and small, but how to keep her own possessions intact and independent: in short, her very existence was at stake.³¹

³⁰ See part of the treaty with the Khati (Hittites) on pages 43, 44.

³¹ Assyria, Chaldea, Persia in turn rose and fell. The second volume of Maspero's great work on Egypt is entitled *The Struggle of the Nations* and the third volume is called *The Passing of the Empires*. You will all enjoy looking up more details in those volumes.

Egypt will come into our view in the time of Alexander the Great and later when Cleopatra was queen of Egypt, but otherwise we shall scarcely notice her again. She came before long under Mohammedan control, and is still nominally under Turkish rule, though England has exercised a very helpful controlling influence over her.

II—BABYLONIA

Like the Egyptian civilization, the Babylonian civilization had its birth between the sea and the dry land on a low, marshy, alluvial soil, flooded annually by the rivers which traverse it, devastated at long intervals by tidal waves of extraordinary violence. The Euphrates and its branches do not at all times succeed in reaching the sea: they are lost for the most part in vast lagoons to which the tide comes up, and in its ebb bears their waters away with it. Reeds grow there luxuriantly in enormous beds, and reach sometimes a height of from thirteen to sixteen feet; banks of black and putrid mud emerge amidst the green growth, and give off deadly emanations. Winter is scarcely felt here: snow is unknown, hoar-frost is rarely seen, but sometimes in the morning a thin film of ice covers the marshes, to disappear under the first rays of the sun. For six weeks in November and December there is much rain: after this period there are only occasional showers, occurring at longer and longer intervals until May, when they entirely cease, and the summer sets in, to last until the following November. There are almost six continuous months of depressing and moist heat, which overcomes both men and animals and makes them incapable of any constant effort. Sometimes a south or east wind suddenly rises, and bearing with it across the fields and canals whirlwinds of sand, burns up in its passage the little verdure which the sun had spared. Swarms of locusts follow in its train, and complete the work of devastation.

The first races to colonize this country of rivers, or at any rate the first of which we can find traces, seem to have belonged to three different types. The most important were the Semites. Side by side with these Semites, the monuments give evidence of a race of ill-defined character called Sumerians.¹ They came, it would appear, from some northern country; they brought with them from their original home a curious system of writing, which,

¹ They are believed to have been a white race, though not Indo-Europeans, and to have had a high civilization, which the Semites adopted.

modified, transformed, and adopted by ten different nations, has preserved for us all that we know in regard to the majority of the empires which rose and fell in Western Asia before the Persian conquest. Semite or Sumerian, it is still doubtful which preceded the other at the mouths of the Euphrates. The Sumerians had already mingled closely with the Semites when we first hear of them. Their language gave way to the Semetic.

The soil was almost as fertile as the loam of Egypt. Wheat and barley are considered indigenous on the plains of the Euphrates; it is supposed to be here that they were first cultivated in Western Asia, and that they spread from thence to Syria, Egypt and the whole of Europe.

We know nothing of the efforts which the first inhabitants—Sumerians and Semites—had to make in order to control the waters and to bring the land under culture: the most ancient monuments exhibit them as already possessors of the soil and in a forward state of civilization. Their chief cities² were divided into two groups: one in the south, in the neighborhood of the sea; the other in a northern direction, in the region where the Euphrates and Tigris are separated from each other by merely a narrow strip of land. The southern group consisted of seven, of which Eridu lay nearest to the coast.³ The mound of Mugheir marks the site of Uru,⁴ the most important if not the oldest, of the southern cities. Lagash occupied the site of the modern Telloh⁵ to the north of Eridu.

But the cities of the Euphrates attract no attention, like those of the Nile, by the magnificence of their ruins; they are merely heaps of rubbish, mounds of stiff and greyish clay, cracked by the sun, washed into deep crevasses by the rain, and bearing no apparent traces of the handiwork of man. As stone had to be brought from a great distance and at considerable expense, they used it

² or city-kingdoms.

³ The yearly increase of soil brought down by the rivers has gradually extended the coast into the Persian Gulf leaving the site of Eridu 100 miles inland.

⁴ Special topic: Recent Excavations at Ur.

⁵ Special topic: Excavations at Telloh. Here were found over 30,000 tablets.

very sparingly. Crude brick, burnt brick, enamelled brick, but always and everywhere brick was the principal element in their construction. The soil of the marshes or of the plains, separated from the pebbles and foreign substances which it contained, mixed with grass or chopped straw, moistened with water, and trodden underfoot, furnished the ancient builders with materials of incredible tenacity. This was moulded into thin square bricks, eight inches to a foot across, and three to four inches thick, but rarely larger: they were stamped on the flat side, with the name of the reigning sovereign, and were then dried in the sun.

While the Egyptian temple spread over a large area, the Babylonian temple strove to attain as high an elevation as possible. The "ziggurats," whose angular profile is a special characteristic of the landscape of the Euphrates, were composed of several immense cubes, piled up on one another, and diminishing in size up to the small shrine by which they were crowned and wherein the god himself was supposed to dwell. None of them rises directly from the surface of the ground, but they are all built on a raised platform, which consequently places the foundations of the temple nearly on a level with the roofs of the surrounding houses. The raised platform of the temple of Nannar at Uru still measures twenty feet in height.

The gods of the Euphrates, like those of the Nile, constituted a multitude of visible and invisible beings; but, whereas in Egypt they were on the whole friendly to man, or at best indifferent in regard to him, in Babylonia they for the most part pursued him with hatred, and seemed to exist only in order to destroy him. Some floated in the air and presided over the unhealthy winds. The Southwest Wind, the most cruel of them all, stalked over the solitudes of Arabia, whence he suddenly issued during the most oppressive months of the year: he collected round him as he passed the malarial vapours given off by the marshes under the heat of the sun, and he spread them over the country, striking down in his violence not only man and beast, but destroying harvests, pasturage, and even trees. The genii of fevers and mad-

ness crept in silently everywhere. The plague alternately slumbered or made furious onslaughts among crowded populations. Imps haunted the houses, goblins wandered about the water's edge, ghouls lay in wait for travellers in unfrequented places, and the dead quitting their tombs in the night stole stealthily among the living to satiate themselves with their blood. They were represented as creatures in whom the body of a man would be joined grotesquely to the limbs of animals. Birds' claws, fishes' scales, a bull's tail, several pairs of wings, the head of a lion, vulture, hyaena, or wolf were often added; when the creature had a human head, it was as hideous and distorted as possible. The Southwest Wind was distinguished from all the rest by the many elements of which his body was composed.

The gods formed, as in Egypt, a complete feudal system, whose chiefs each took up their residence in a particular city. Anu was worshipped in Uruk, Enlil-Bel reigned in Nippur;⁶ Ea, the lord of the waters reigned in Eridu; the moon-god, Sin, alone governed two large fiefs, Uru in the extreme south, and Harran towards the extreme northwest, while Merodach (or Marduk) ruled at Babylon. Merodach, the son of Ea, was regarded as the star which had arisen from the abyss to illuminate the world, and to confer upon mankind eternal wisdom.

The Babylonians, like the Egyptians, fancied they discerned in the stars the outline of a great number of various figures—men, animals, monsters, real and imaginary objects, a lance, a bow, a fish, a scorpion, ears of wheat, a bull, and a lion. Twelve of these figures, distinguishable by their brilliancy, were arranged along the celestial horizon in the pathway of the sun, and watched over his daily course along the walls of the world. These divided this part of the sky into as many domains, or "houses."⁷

⁶ Special topic: Excavations conducted by the University of Pennsylvania at Nippur.

⁷ or Zodiac. The Babylonians divided the year into twelve months, the week into seven days, the day into hours, the hour into sixty minutes, their pound of weight, the *mina*, into sixty shekels. They knew something of mathematics. Like the Egyptians, they named years for events or reigns. They had wheeled carts and chariots, and oxen and donkeys.

We must not expect to find on the plains of the Euphrates the rock-cut tombs, the mastabas or pyramids, of Egypt. No mountain chain ran on either side of the river, formed of rock soft enough to be cut or hollowed easily into chambers or sepulchral halls, and at the same time sufficiently hard to prevent the tunnels once cut from falling in. The alluvial soil upon which the Babylonian cities were built, far from preserving the dead body, rapidly decomposed it under the influence of heat and moisture: vaults constructed in it would soon be invaded by water in spite of masonry; paintings and sculpture would soon be eaten away by nitre, and the funereal furniture and the coffin quickly destroyed. The dwelling-house of the Babylonian dead was, therefore, constructed of dried or burnt brick, and its form varied much from the most ancient times. Sometimes it was a great vaulted chamber, and contained the remains of one or two bodies walled up within it. At other times it consisted merely of an earthen jar, in which the corpse had been inserted in a bent-up posture, or was composed of two enormous cylindrical jars, which when united and cemented with bitumen, formed a kind of barrel around the body. Cremation seems in many cases to have been preferred to burial in a tomb.

The position of a scribe was an important one. His education differed but little from that given to the Egyptian scribe; he learned the art of writing, of calculating quickly, and of making out bills correctly. We may well ask whether he ever employed papyrus, or prepared skins for these purposes; yet clay appears to have been the only medium which the scribes possessed. They were always provided with slabs of a fine plastic clay, carefully mixed and kept sufficiently moist to take easily the impression of an object, but at the same time sufficiently firm to prevent the marks once made from becoming either blurred or effaced. When a scribe had a text to copy or a document to draw up, he chose out one of his slabs, which he placed flat upon his left palm, and taking in the right hand a triangular stylus of flint, copper, bronze, or bone, he at once set to work. The instrument in early times terminated in a fine point; in later times the extremity of the stylus

was cut with a bevel, and the impression then took the shape of a metal nail or a wedge.⁸ They wrote from left to right along the upper part of the tablet, and covered both sides of it with closely written lines which sometimes ran over on the edges. When the writing was finished, the scribe sent his work to the potter, who put it in the kiln and baked it, or the writer may have had a small oven at his own disposal, as a clerk with us would have his table or desk. These clay books were heavy to hold and clumsy to handle; but on the other hand, a poem, baked, ran less danger of destruction than if scribbled in ink on sheets of papyrus. Fire could make no impression on it; it could withstand water for a considerable length of time; even if broken, as long as it was not pulverized, the entire document could be restored, with the exception, perhaps, of a few signs, or some scraps of a sentence. The inscriptions which have been saved from the foundations of the most ancient temples, several of which date back forty or fifty centuries, are for the most part as clear and legible as when they left the hands of the writer who engraved them or of the workmen who baked them. It is owing to the material to which they were committed that we possess the principal works of Babylonian literature which have come down to us—poems, annals, hymns, magical incantations; how few fragments of these would ever have reached us had their authors confided them to parchment or paper, after the manner of the Egyptian scribes!⁹ The greatest danger that they ran was that of being forgotten in the corner of the chamber in which they had been kept, or buried in the rubbish of a building after a fire or some violent catastrophe; even then the *debris* were the means of preserving them, by falling over them and covering them up. Protected under the ruins, they would lie there for centuries, till the fortunate explorer should bring them to light and deliver them over to the patient study of the learned.

If at Babylon we rarely meet with those representations,

⁸ Latin, *cuneus*; hence the writing is called "cuneiform." Special topics: The Behistun Rock; Sir Henry Rawlinson (who deciphered it in 1835-1850).

⁹ Special topics: The Babylonian Account of Creation; The Babylonian Account of the Deluge; The Story of Gilgames; etc., etc.

which we find everywhere in the tombs of Saqqâra or Gizeh, of the people themselves and their families, their occupations, amusements, and daily intercourse, we possess, on the other hand, that of which the ruins of Memphis have furnished us but scanty instances up to the present time, namely, judicial documents, regulating the mutual relations of people and conferring a legal sanction on the various events of their life. Whether it were a question of buying lands or contracting a marriage, of a loan on interest, or the sale of slaves, the scribe was called in with his soft tablets to write out the necessary agreement.

The method of signing these tablets was curious. An indentation was made with the finger nail on one of the sides of the tablet, and this mark was followed or preceded by a name, "Nail of Zabudamik," "Nail of Abzii." In later times, only the buyer and witnesses approved by a nail mark, while the seller appended his seal. Every one of any importance possessed a seal, which he wore attached to his wrist or hung round his neck by a cord; he scarcely ever allowed it to be separated from his person during his lifetime, and after death it was placed with him in the tomb in order to prevent any improper use being made of it. It was usually a cylinder, of marble, red or green jasper, agate, cornelian, onyx, or rock crystal, but rarely of metal. Engraved upon it in *intaglio*¹⁰ was an emblem or subject chosen by the owner, such as the single figure of a god or goddess, an act of adoration, a sacrifice, or an episode in the story of Gilgames, followed sometimes by a name and title. The cylinder was rolled or merely pressed on the clay, in the space reserved for it.

The slaves were numerous. They were drawn partly from foreign races; prisoners who had been wounded and carried from the field of battle, or fugitives who had fallen into the hand of the victors after a defeat. They formed, beneath the superior native Semite and Sumerian population, an inferior servile class, spread alike throughout the towns and country, who were continually reinforced by individuals of the native race, such as foundlings,

¹⁰ cut so that the figure will stand out.

women and children sold by husband or father, debtors deprived by creditors of their liberty, and criminals judicially condemned. The law took no individual account of them, but counted them by heads, as so many cattle: they belonged to their respective masters in the same fashion as did the beasts of his flock or the trees of his garden, and their life or death was dependent upon his will. If we knew more of the internal history of the great Babylonian cities, we should no doubt come to see what an important part the servile element played in them; and could we trace it back for a few generations, we should probably discover that there were few great families who did not reckon a slave or a freeman among their ancestors.

It would be interesting to follow this people, made up of such complex elements, in all their daily work and recreation, as we are able to do in the case of the contemporary Egyptians; but the monuments which might furnish us with the necessary materials are scarce, and the positive information to be gleaned from them amounts to but little. We are tolerably safe, however, in supposing the more wealthy cities to have been, as a whole, very similar in appearance to those existing at the present day in the regions which as yet have been scarcely touched by the advent of European civilization. Sinuous, narrow, muddy streets, littered with domestic refuse, in which flocks of ravens and wandering packs of dogs perform with more or less efficiency the duties of sanitary officers; whole quarters of the town composed of huts made of reeds and puddled clay, low houses of crude brick, surmounted perhaps even in those times by the noisy bazaars, where each trade is located in its special lanes and blind alleys; silent and desolate spaces occupied by palaces and gardens, in which the private life of the wealthy was concealed from public gaze; and looking down upon this medley of individual buildings, the palaces and temples with their ziggurats crowned with gilded and painted sanctuaries.

Foreign commerce entailed considerable risk. Men would set off alone or in companies for Elam or the northern regions, for

Syria, or even for so distant a country as Egypt, and they would bring back in their caravans all that was accounted precious in those lands. Overland routes were not free from dangers; not only were nomad tribes and professional bandits constantly hovering around the traveller, but the inhabitants of the villages through which he passed, the local lords and kings of the countries which he traversed, obliged him often to pay dearly for right of way through their territory. There were less risks in choosing a sea route: the Euphrates on one side, the Tigris on the other, ran through a country peopled with a rich industrial population, among whom Babylonian merchandise was easily and profitably sold or exchanged for commodities which would command a good price at the end of the voyage.

The vessels generally were keleks or "kufas," but the latter were of immense size. The body of the boat was very light, being made of osier or willow covered with skins sewn together; a layer of straw was spread on the bottom, on which were piled the bales or chests, which were again protected by a rough thatch of straw. The crew was composed of two oarsmen at least and sometimes a few donkeys: the merchants then pursued their way up stream till they had disposed of their cargo, and taken in a sufficient freight for their return voyage. The dangers, though apparently not so great as those by the land route, were not the less real. The boat was liable to sink or run aground near the bank, the dwellers in the neighborhood of the river might intercept it and pillage its contents, a war might break out between two kingdoms and suspend all commerce: the merchants' career continually vacillated between servitude, death, and fortune.

As is often the case among half-civilized peoples, the goldsmiths worked in the precious metals with much facility and skill. The early Babylonians were not a whit behind the Egyptians in this handicraft, judging from the golden ornaments, the bracelets, ear and finger rings with which the tombs have furnished us considerable numbers. Alongside the goldsmiths there must have been a whole army of lapidaries and gem-cutters occupied in the

engraving of seals. Numerous and delicate operations were required to change a scrap of crude rock, marble, granite, agate, onyx, green and red jasper, crystal or lapis-lazuli, into one of those marvellous seals which are now found by the hundred scattered throughout the museums of Europe. They had to be rounded, reduced to the proper proportions, and polished, before the subject or legend could be engraved upon them. To drill a hole through them required great dexterity, and some of the lapidaries, from a dread of breaking the cylinder, either did not pierce it at all, or merely bored a shallow hole in each extremity to allow it to roll freely in its metallic mounting. The seal of Shargani, King of Agade, that of Binganishar-ali, and many others, which have been picked up by chance in the excavations, are true bas-reliefs, reduced and condensed, so to speak, to the space of something like a square inch of surface, but conceived with an artistic ingenuity and executed with a boldness which modern engravers have rarely equalled and never surpassed.

The countries of the Euphrates were renowned in classic times for the beauty of the embroidered and painted stuffs which they manufactured. Nothing has come down to us of these Babylonian tissues of which the Greek and Latin writers extolled the magnificence, but we may form some idea, from the statues and figures engraved on cylinders, of what the weavers and embroiderers of this ancient time were capable. Most of these stuffs preserved their original white or creamy color. The Babylonians, however, like many other Asiatic peoples, had a strong preference for lively colors, and the outdoor garments and gala attire of the rich were distinguished by a profusion of blue patterns on a red ground, or red on blue, arranged in stripes, zigzags, checks, and dots or circles.

We know nothing of the bakers, butchers, carriers, masons, and other artisans who supplied the necessities of the cities; if we should succeed, some day in obtaining information about them, we shall probably find that their condition was as miserable as that of their Egyptian contemporaries.

The lords of Babylon had, ordinarily, a twofold function, religious and military, the priest at first taking precedence of the soldier, but gradually yielding to the latter as the town increased in power. Each ruler was obliged to go in state to the temple of Bel Merodach within a year of his accession: there he had to take the hands of the divine statue, just as a vassal would do homage to his liege, and those only could legally call themselves Kings of Babylon—*sharru Babili*—who had not only performed this rite, but renewed it annually. Sargon the Elder¹¹ lived in Babylon and built himself a palace there.

In later times, when Babylon had attained to universal power, and it was desired to furnish her kings with a continuous history, the names of earlier rulers were sought out, and added to those of such foreign princes as had from time to time enjoyed the sovereignty over them—thus forming an interminable list which would well compare with that of the Pharaohs. This list has come down to us incomplete, and its remains do not permit of our determining the exact order of reigns, or the status of the individuals who composed it.

Towards the end of the XXVth century before our era, however, a dynasty rose into power of which all the members come within the range of history. Of these, Khammurabi's long reign of fifty-five years has hitherto yielded us but a small number of monuments—seals, heads of sceptres, alabaster vases and pompous inscriptions, scarcely any of them being of historical interest.¹² Khammurabi was the first that we know of who attempted to organize and reduce to a single system the complicated network

¹¹ A Semetic ruler of c. 2750 B. C. Bricks stamped with his name were found by the University of Pennsylvania Expedition, 34 feet below the surface, in a mound at Nippur. The 30 feet of debris below these bricks are estimated to represent 3000 earlier years. So, as Sayce says, Sargon I "lately spoken of as a 'half-mythical personage' has now emerged into the full glare of authentic history." A seal of Sargon's has been found which Maspero says, "Must be ranked among the masterpieces of Oriental engraving." Sayce also adds: "Even a postal service had already been established along the high roads which knit the several parts of the empire together, and some of the clay seals which franked the letters are now in the Museum of the Louvre."

¹² See note 13. Khammurabi ruled perhaps from 2267 to 2213 B.C.

of ditches and channels which intersected the territory belonging to the great cities between Babylon and the sea. Khammurabi informs us how Anu and Bel, having confided to him the government of Sumer and Accad, and having placed in his hands the reins of power, he dug the Nâr-Khammurabi, the source of wealth to the people, which brings abundance of water to the country of Sumer and Accad. "I turned both its banks into cultivated ground, I heaped up mounds of grain and I furnished perpetual water for the people of Sumir and Accad.... Then it was that Khammurabi, the powerful king, the favorite of the great gods, I myself, according to the prodigious strength with which Merodach had endued me, I constructed a high fortress, upon mounds of earth; its summit rises to the height of the mountains, at the head of the Nâr-Khammurabi, the source of wealth to the people. This fortress I called Dur-Sinmuballit-abimuâliidiya, the Fortress of Sinmuballit, the father who begat me, so that the name of Sinmuballit, the father who begat me, may endure in the habitations of the world."¹³

¹³ We omit more from Maspero, as in December 1901 and January 1902, several years after Maspero's great work was published, J. de Morgan a French archeologist, found at Susa a round shaft of stone (a fine granite called diorite) nearly eight feet high, around which in 3600 lines were cut the laws of Khammurabi. This shaft is now in the Louvre. This is supposed to be the oldest code of laws yet found. These are a few of them as translated by Robert Francis Harper in *The Code of Khammurabi*, University of Chicago Press, 1904:

If a man bring an accusation against a man, and charge him with a (capital) crime, but cannot prove it, he, the accuser, shall be put to death.

If a man charge a man with sorcery, and cannot prove it, he who is charged with sorcery shall go to the river, into the river he shall throw himself and if the river overcome him, his accuser shall take to himself his house (estate). If the river show that man to be innocent and he come forth unharmed, he who charged him with sorcery shall be put to death. He who threw himself into the river shall take to himself the house of his accuser.

If a man steal the property of a god (temple) or palace, that man shall be put to death; and he who receives from his hand the stolen (property) shall also be put to death.

If a man steals a man's son, who is a minor, he shall be put to death.

If a fire break out in a man's house and a man who goes to extinguish it cast his eye on the furniture of the owner of the house, and take the furniture of the owner of the house, that man shall be thrown into that fire.

If a woman hate her husband, and say: "Thou shalt not have me," they shall inquire into her antecedents for her defects; and if she have been a careful mistress

and be without reproach and her husband have been going about and greatly belittling her, that woman has no blame. She shall receive her dowry and shall go to her father's house.

If she have not been a careful mistress, have gadded about, have neglected her house and have belittled her husband, they shall throw that woman into the water.

If a son strike his father, they shall cut off his fingers.

If a man destroy the eye of another man, they shall destroy his eye.

If one break a man's bone, they shall break his bone.

If one destroy the eye of a freeman or break the bone of a freeman, he shall pay one mana of silver.

If one destroy the eye of a man's slave or break a bone of a man's slave he shall pay one half his price.

If a builder build a house for a man and do not make its construction firm, and the house . . . collapse and cause the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death.

If it cause the death of a son of the owner of the house, they shall put to death a son of that builder.

If it cause the death of a slave of the owner of the house, he shall give to the owner of the house a slave of equal value.¹⁴

Fifty-five letters of Khammurabi have been found also, and have been edited by L. W. King. Special topics: The Finding of the Code; The Letters; A school-house of Khammurabi's time.

¹⁴ We print these laws by kind permission of the University of Chicago Press.

III—SYRIA¹

Some countries seem destined from their origin to become the battlefields of the contending nations which environ them. Year after year there will be scenes of bloody conflict, in which petty armies will fight petty battles on behalf of petty interests, but so fiercely, and with such furious animosity, that the country will suffer from the strife as much as, or even more than, from an invasion. There will be no truce to their struggles until they all fall under the sway of a foreign master, and, except in the interval between two conquests, they will have no national existence, their history being almost entirely merged in that of other nations.

From remote antiquity Syria was in the condition just described. By its position it formed a kind of meeting-place where most of the military nations of the ancient world were bound sooner or later to come violently into collision. Confined between the sea and the desert, Syria offers the only route of easy access to an army marching northwards from Africa into Asia; and all conquerors, whether attracted to Mesopotamia or to Egypt by the accumulated riches on the banks of the Euphrates or the Nile, were obliged to pass through it in order to reach the object of their cupidity.

A choice of several routes into Asia was open to the traveller from Egypt to Babylonia; but the most direct of them passed through the town of Zalu. The road ran for some distance over a region which was covered by the inundation of the Nile during six months of the year; it then turned eastward, and for some distance skirted the seashore, passing between the Mediterranean and the swamp which writers of the Greek period called the Lake of Sirbonis. This stage of the journey was beset with difficulties, for the Sirbonian Lake did not always present the same aspect, and

¹ For over 1000 years after Khammurabi's time the history of Babylonia is rather vague. We therefore leave Babylonia, and go to Syria on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea. It may be interesting to the pupil to try to get some idea of how long 1000 years is. If an inch represents his age, how long would the line on the blackboard need to be to represent 1000 years? Or, if one cent were put at five per cent compound interest (compounded only every twenty years) how much would it amount to in 1000 years?

its margins were constantly shifting. When the canals which connected it with the open sea happened to become obstructed, the sheet of water subsided from evaporation, leaving in many places merely an expanse of shifting mud, often concealed by sand which the wind brought up from the desert. Travellers ran imminent risk of sinking in this quagmire, and the Greek historians tell of large armies being almost entirely swallowed up in it.

Northeastward, the coast turns and is flanked with high sand-hills, behind which the caravans pursue their way, obtaining merely occasional glimpses of the sea. Here and there, under the shelter of a tower or a half-ruined fortress, the traveller would have found wells of indifferent water, till on reaching the confines of Syria he arrived at the fortified village of Raphia.

Beyond Raphia, Gaza itself came into view among the trees standing on its wall-crowned hill. The Egyptians, on their march from the Nile valley, were wont to stop at this spot to recover from their fatigues; it was their first halting-place beyond the frontier, and the news which would reach them here prepared them in some measure for what awaited them further on.

There were to the north of Gaza, two large walled towns, Ascalon and Joppa, in whose roadsteads merchant vessels were accustomed to take hasty refuge in tempestuous weather; and in the neighborhood of the roads which led to the fords of the Jordan, were Gibeah, and finally Urusalim, our Jerusalem.

Almost the only remains of these people which have come down to us consist of indestructible wells and cisterns, or wine and oil presses hollowed out of the rock.

Toward Aluna the way began to ascend Mount Carmel by a narrow and giddy track cut in the rocky side of the precipice. Beyond the Mount, it led, by a rapid descent into a plain covered with corn and verdure, to the foot of Tabor, where it came to an end. Two side ranges running almost parallel—little Hermon and Gilboa—serve rather to connect the plain of Megiddo with the valley of the Jordan than to separate them. No corner of the world has been the scene of more sanguinary engagements, or has

witnessed century after century so many armies crossing its borders and coming into conflict with one another. Every military leader who, after leaving Africa, was able to seize Gaza and Ascalon became at once master of Southern Syria.

From Megiddo, the conqueror had a choice of three routes. One ran in an oblique direction to the west, and struck the Mediterranean near Acre. The second of the roads leading from Megiddo described an almost symmetrical curve eastwards, finally reaching Damascus. The third road from Megiddo took the shortest way possible to Qodshu.

Carchemish on the upper Euphrates was the citadel and sanctuary of the surrounding country. Whoever could make himself master of it would have the whole country at his feet. Its wall still rises some five and twenty or thirty feet above the plain. Carchemish was the last stage in a conqueror's march coming from the south. For an invader approaching from the east or north it formed his first station.

The gods of Syria, like those of Egypt and of the countries watered by the Euphrates, were feudal princes distributed over the surface of the earth, their number corresponding with that of the independent states. Each nation, each tribe, each city, worshipped its own lord—*Adoni*—or its master—*Baal*—and each of these was designated by a special title to distinguish him from neighboring *Baalim*, or masters. The *Baal* who ruled at Zebub was styled "Master of Zebub," or *Baal Zebub*. The worship of these gods involved the performance of ceremonies more bloody and licentious even than those practised by other races. The *Baalim* thirsted for blood, nor would they be satisfied with any common blood such as generally contented their brethren in Babylonia or Egypt; they imperatively demanded human as well as animal sacrifices. Among several of the Syrian nations they had a right to the first-born male of each family; this right was generally commuted, either by a money payment or by subjecting the infant to circumcision. Indeed in times of national danger, the king and nobles would furnish, not merely a single victim,

but as many as the priests chose to demand. While they were being burnt alive on the knees of the statue, or before the sacred emblem, their cries of pain were drowned by the piping of flutes or the blare of trumpets, the parents standing near the altar without sign of pity, and dressed for a festival. Such sacrifices were, however, the exception, and the shedding of their own blood by the priests sufficed, as a rule, for the daily wants of the god. Seizing their knives, they would slash their arms and breasts with the view of compelling, by this offering of their own persons, the good will of the Baalîm.

Almost everywhere, but especially in the regions of the Jordan, were monuments which popular piety surrounded with a superstitious reverence. Such were the isolated boulders, or, as we should call them "menhirs" reared on the summit of a knoll, or on the edge of a tableland; dolmens, formed of a flat slab placed on the top of two roughly hewn supports, cromlechs or, that is to say, stone circles, in the centre of which might be found a beth-el. We do not know who set up these monuments, nor at what time: the fact that they are in no way different from those which are to be met with in Western Europe and the North of Africa has given rise to the theory that they were the work of some one primeval race which wandered ceaselessly over the ancient world.

IV—THE HEBREWS OR ISRAELITES¹

The Israelites belonged to that family of Semitic extraction which we know by the monuments and tradition to have been scattered in ancient times along the western shores of the Persian Gulf and on the banks of the Euphrates.² Their earliest chiefs bore the names of towns or peoples; and it is related that Terakh had dwelt in Ur-Kashdim, the Ur or Uru of the Babylonians. He is said to have had three sons—Abraham, Nakhôr, and Harân. The tribes who crossed the Euphrates called themselves or were known by others, as the 'Ibrim, or Hebrews, the people from beyond the river.

One important fact arrests our attention: certain tribes of the Israelites quitted Southern Syria and settled on the banks of the Nile. A comparatively ancient tradition relates that the Hebrews arrived in Egypt during the reign of Aphôbis, a Hyksôs king, possibly the monarch who restored the monuments of the Theban Pharaohs, and engraved his name on the sphinxes of Amenemhât III. The land of Goshen, which the Hebrews obtained is that which, down to the present day, is most frequently visited by nomads. In pursuing their calling as shepherds, almost within sight of the rich cities of the Nile valley, they never forsook the God of their fathers to bow down before the gods of Egypt; whether He was already known to them as Jahveh, or was worshipped under the collective name of Elohîm, they served Him with almost unbroken fidelity even in the presence of Râ and Osiris, of Phtah and Sûtkhû.

The Israelites, when they set out from Egypt,³ were not yet a nation. They were but a confused horde, flying with their herds from their pursuers, with no resources, badly armed and unfit to sustain the attack of regular troops. After leaving Sinai, they wandered for some time among the solitudes of Arabia Petraea

¹ Their history is still somewhat confused. See articles "Palestine" and "Jews" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. The Tell-el-Amarna writings have thrown some light on the subject as have modern excavations.

² Breasted believes they came from the Arabian desert.

³ Some scholars think they left Egypt during the time of Ramses II.

in search of some uninhabited country where they could fix their tents, and at length settled on the borders of Idumaea, in the mountainous region surrounding Kadesh-Barnea. Kadesh rejoiced in the possession of a wonderful well; and a fragment of the psalmody of Israel at the time of their sojourn here still echoes in a measure the transports of joy which the people gave way to at the discovery of a new spring: "Spring up, O well; sing ye unto it: the well which the princes digged, which the nobles of the people delved with the sceptre and with their staves." The wanderers took possession of this region after some successful brushes with the enemy, and settled there. Their numbers had increased rapidly and with this increase came a consciousness of their own strength, so that after a lapse of two or three generations, they may be said to have constituted a considerable nation. Its elements were not, however, firmly welded together; they consisted of an indefinite number of clans, which were again sub-divided into several families. The clans were grouped into tribes; and the heroes of all the tribes were held to have been brethren, sons of one father, and under the protection of one God.⁴ He was known as the Jahveh with whom Abraham of old had made a solemn covenant.

They did not gain possession of the land all at once, but established themselves in it gradually by detachments, some settling at the fords of Jericho⁵ others more to the north, and in the central valley of the Jordan as far up as Shechem. The latter at once came into contact with a population⁶ having a higher civilization than themselves, and well equipped for a vigorous resistance; the walled towns which had defied the veterans of the Pharaohs had not much to fear from the bands of undisciplined Israelites wandering in their neighborhood.

The history of this period lacks the unity and precision with which we are at first tempted to credit it. The Israelites, when transplanted into the promised land, did not immediately lose the

⁴ We owe to the Hebrews this first general belief in one God.

⁵ Special topic: Excavations at Jericho.

⁶ the Canaanites.

nomadic habits they had acquired in the desert. Of such unsettled and turbulent times we cannot expect an uninterrupted history: some salient episodes alone remain, spread over a period of nearly two centuries, and from these we can gather some idea of the progress made by the Israelites, and observe their stages of transition from a cluster of semi-barbarous hordes to a settled nation ripe for monarchy. . . .

Saul, as King of Israel, led much the same sort of life as when he was merely a Benjamite chief.

Among the men of distinguished valor who had taken service under Saul, he soon singled out David, son of Jesse, a native of Bethlehem of Judah. David was the first Judean hero, the typical king who served as a model to all subsequent monarchs.⁷

Solomon⁸ set himself to complete the task which his father had merely sketched out.⁹ The political supremacy which he acquired for Judah could not fail to rouse the jealousy of the other tribes. In reality the edifice which David had raised with such difficulty tottered on its foundations before the death of his successor; the foreign vassals were either in a restless state or ready to throw off their allegiance; money was scarce, and twenty Galilaean towns had been perforce ceded to Hiram¹⁰ to pay the debts due to him for the building of the temple; murmurings were heard among the people, who desired an easier life. In a future age, amid the perils which assailed Jerusalem, and the miseries of the exile,¹¹ the Israelites, contrasting their humiliation with the glory of the past, forgot the reproaches with which their forefathers had addressed the house of David, and surrounded its memory with the halo of romance. David again became the hero, and Solomon the saint and sage of his race; the latter "spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five."

⁷ To him tradition attributes the authorship of many of the Psalms.

⁸ Son of David. Tradition and legend have made Solomon great in wisdom and in riches. To him have been attributed *Ecclesiastes*, *Proverbs*, and *Canticles*, or *The Song of Solomon*, all of which were written or compiled later.

⁹ Special topic: Solomon's Temple.

¹⁰ King of Tyre.

¹¹ See note 12.

His contemporaries, however, seem to have regarded him as a tyrant who oppressed them with taxes, and whose death was unregretted. The kingdom which had been created by David and Solomon rested solely on their individual efforts, and its continuance could be insured only by bequeathing it to descendants who had sufficient energy and prudence to consolidate its weaker elements, and build up the tottering materials which were constantly threatening to fall asunder. As soon as the government had passed into the hands of the weakling Rehoboam, the parts of the kingdom, which had for a few years been held together, now resolved themselves, according to their geographical positions, into two masses of unequal numbers and extent—Judah in the south, and Israel in the north and the regions beyond Jordan, occupying three-fourths of the territory which had belonged to David and Solomon.¹²

¹² We cannot go into the later history of Palestine except to note a few important facts. Sargon II, of Assyria, conquered Israel in 722 B. C. and is said to have carried off as captives to Babylon 27,290 of the Israelites. Sennacherib, son and successor of Sargon II, attacked the kingdom of Judah and carried off many captives; but so aroused were the people by the words of the prophet Isaiah that they united against Assyria. This, and a plague which is said to have decimated Sennacherib's army saved Jerusalem from capture. In 586 B. C. Nebuchadnezzar, ruler of Chaldea, destroyed Jerusalem and carried many of the inhabitants of Judah as captives to Babylon. Some Hebrews fled to Egypt including the prophet Jeremiah. (Special topic: A Hebrew Colony in Egypt. See Breasted, *Ancient Times*, p. 213, 215).

About fifty years later Cyrus, king of Persia, who had conquered Chaldea, permitted the exiled Jews to return to Jerusalem.

Palestine, however, remained henceforth, except for a short independence under the Maccabees, a conquered land, ruled as a province in turn by Persia, Alexander the Great, Egypt, Rome and the Mohammedans. Since the world war, it has been controlled by England.

This later history is not important. Two facts, chiefly, should be remembered by the student: the Hebraic belief in one God and their high spiritual ideal; and their wonderful literature which contains masterpieces of oratory, history, drama, philosophy and poetry, and is found chiefly in the Bible.

V—THE PHOENICIANS

In Phoenicia the sea was everything: of land¹ there was but just enough to furnish a site for a score of towns, with their surrounding belt of gardens. Mount Lebanon, with its impenetrable forests, isolated it almost entirely, and acted as the eastward boundary of the long narrow quadrangle hemmed between the mountains and the rocky shore of the sea. At frequent intervals, spurs run out at right angles from the principal chain, forming steep headlands on the sea-front: these cut up the country, small to begin with, into five or six still smaller provinces, each one of which possessed from time immemorial its own independent cities. Through a pass ran the road which joined the great military highway not far from Qodshû.

Gublu, or—as the Greeks named it Byblos,² prided itself on being the most ancient city in the world. The god El had founded it at the dawning of time, on the flank of a hill which is visible from some distance out at sea. A small bay, now filled up, made it an important shipping centre. The temple stood on the top of the hill, a few fragments of its walls still serving to mark the site. Sidon was at first nothing but a poor fishing village on a southern slope of a spit of land which juts out obliquely towards the southwest. It grew from year to year, spreading out over the plain, and became at length one of the most prosperous of the chief cities of the country. Tyre was already an ancient town at the beginning of the Egyptian conquest (1600 B. C.). As in other places of ancient date, the inhabitants rejoiced in stories of the origin of things, in which the city figured as the most venerable in the world. The gods had taught them navigation, and from the beginning of things they had taken to the sea as fishermen, or as explorers in search of new lands.

¹ Roughly speaking, the Phoenicians occupied the middle third (just north of Israel) of the eastern coast of the Mediterranean sea.

² Because the Phoenician traders from Byblos carried papyrus to other lands the word *byblos* came to mean a papyrus roll, that is a book; *biblia* therefore meant "books"; hence our word "Bible."

It was probably the nature of the country itself which contributed more than anything else to make them mariners. The precipitous mountain masses which separate one valley from another rendered communication between them difficult, while they served also as lurking places for robbers. Commerce endeavored to follow, therefore, the sea-route in preference to the devious ways of this highwayman's region, and it accomplished its purpose the more readily because the common occupation of sea-fishing had familiarized the people with every nook and corner on the coast. The continual wash of the surge had worn away the bases of the limestone cliffs, and the superincumbent masses tumbling down into the sea, formed lines of rocks, hardly rising above the water-level, which fringed the headlands with perilous reefs, against which the waves broke continuously at the slightest wind. It required some bravery to approach them, and no little skill to steer one of the frail boats, which these people were accustomed to employ from the earliest times, scatheless amid the breakers. The coasting trade was in full operation, doubtless from the VIth Egyptian dynasty onwards, when the Pharaohs no longer hesitated to embark troops at the mouth of the Nile for speedy transmission to the provinces of southern Syria, and it was by this coasting route that the tin and amber of the north succeeded in reaching the interior of Egypt.³

When on these distant expeditions they were subject to trivial

³ (Quoted from Maspero) "It became in time a common task in the schools of Thebes to describe the typical Syrian tour of some soldier or functionary, and we still possess one of these imaginative stories in which the scribe takes his hero from Qodshu across the Lebanon to Byblos, Berytus, Tyre, and Sidon, "the fish" of which latter place "are more numerous than the grains of sand"; he then makes him cross Galilee and the forest of oaks to Jaffa, climb the mountains of the Dead Sea, and following the maritime route by Raphia, reach Pelusium. The Egyptian galleys thronged the Phoenician ports, while those of Phoenicia visited Egypt. The latter drew so little water that they had no difficulty in coming up the Nile, and the paintings in one of the tombs represent them at the moment of their reaching Thebes. The hull of these vessels was similar to that of the Nile boats, but the bow and stern were terminated by structures which rose at right angles, and respectively gave support to a sort of small platform. Upon this the pilot maintained his position by one of those wondrous feats of equilibrium of which the Orientals were masters."

disasters which might lead to serious consequences. A mast might break, an oar might damage a portion of the bulwarks, a storm might force them to throw overboard part of their cargo or their provisions; in such predicaments they had no means of repairing the damage, and, unable to obtain help in any of the places they might visit, their prospects were of a desperate character. They soon, therefore, learned the necessity of establishing cities of refuge at various points in the countries with which they traded—stations where they could go to refit their vessels, and, if necessary, pass the winter, or wait for fair weather before continuing their voyage. For this purpose they chose by preference islands lying within easy distance of the mainland, like their native cities of Tyre and Arvad, but possessing a good harbour or roadstead. If an island were not available, they selected a peninsula with a narrow isthmus, or a rock standing at the extremity of a promontory, which a handful of men could defend against any attack, and which could be seen from a considerable distance by their pilots. Most of their stations thus happily situated became at length important towns; and such was the rapid spread of these colonies, that before long the Mediterranean was surrounded by an almost unbroken chain of Phoenician strongholds and trading stations.⁴

Their wares comprised weapons and ornaments for men, axes, swords, incised or damascened daggers with hilts of gold or ivory, bracelets, necklaces, amulets of all kinds, enamelled vases, glass-work, stuffs dyed purple or embroidered with gay colours.

The purple used by the Tyrians for dyeing is secreted by several varieties of molluscs common in the Eastern Mediterranean; those most esteemed by the dyers were the *Murex trunculus* and *Murex Brandaris*, and solid masses made up of the detritus of

⁴ We cannot determine the furthest limits reached by the Phoenician traders, since they were wont to designate the distant countries and nations with which they traded by the vague appellations of "Isles of the Sea" and "Peoples of the Sea," refusing to give more accurate information either from jealousy or from a desire to hide from other nations the sources of their wealth. Quoted from the text of Maspero,

these shells are found in enormous quantities in the neighborhood of many Phoenician towns. The coloring matter was secreted in the head of the shellfish. To obtain it the shell was broken by a blow from a hammer, and the small quantity of slightly yellowish liquid which issued from the fracture was carefully collected and stirred about in salt water for three days. It was then boiled in leaden vessels and reduced by simmering over a slow fire; the remainder was strained through a cloth to free it from the particles of flesh still floating in it, and the material to be dyed was then plunged into the liquid. The usual tint thus imparted was that of fresh blood,⁵ in some lights almost approaching to black; but careful manipulation could produce shades of red, dark violet, and amethyst.⁶

Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, Arvad, like most of the civilized nations of Western Asia, had, at first, conducted their diplomatic and commercial correspondence in the cuneiform character impressed upon clay tablets. After an interval of four hundred years or more—during which we have no examples of their monuments,—we find them possessed of a short and commodious script. Phonetic sounds had been resolved into twenty-two sounds, to each of which a special sign was attached, which collectively took the place of hundreds or thousands of signs formerly required. This was an alphabet, the first in point of time, but so ingenious and so pliable that the majority of ancient and modern nations have found it able to supply all their needs—Greeks and Europeans of the western Mediterranean on the one hand, and Semites of all kinds, Persians and Hindus on the other. It must have originated between the end of the XVIII (c. 1400 B. C.) and the beginning of the XXIst (c. 1100 B. C.) dynasties, and the existence of Pharaonic rule in Phoenicia during this period has led more than one modern scholar to assume that it developed under Egyptian influence. Some affirm that it is traceable directly to hieroglyphs.

⁵ Could it be possible that the Greeks were thinking of this dye, when they called the Phoenicians, *Phoeni* from *phoinos* (blood-red)?

⁶ "Tyrian purple." "Born to the purple" came to mean "of royal birth."

Some scholars seek the prototype of the alphabet elsewhere—either in Babylon, in Asia Minor, or even in Crete. It is no easy matter to get at the truth amid these conflicting theories. Two points only are indisputable; first, the almost unanimous agreement among writers of classical times in ascribing the first alphabet to the Phoenicians; and second, the Phoenician origin of the Greek, and afterwards of the Latin alphabet which we employ today.

VI—THE HITTITES

Beyond Naharaim, in the deep recesses of the Amanus and Taurus mountains, there had lived, for no one knows how many centuries, the rude and war-like tribes of the Khâti, related not so much to the Semites of the Syrian plain as to the populations of doubtful race and language who occupied the upper basins of the Halys and Euphrates.¹ Their country extended to the westward and northward, beyond the mountains, into that region, known afterwards as Asia Minor. The mountains and elevated plateaus were subject to extraordinary vicissitudes of heat and cold. If the summer burnt up everything, the winter reigned here with an extreme rigour, and dragged on for months: clothing and foot-gear had to be seen to, if the snow and icy winds of December were to be resisted.

The Babylonian conquest had barely touched them; the Egyptian campaign had not more effect, and Thutmosis III, himself, after having crossed their frontiers and sacked several of their towns, made no serious pretence to reckon them among his subjects. Their chiefs were accustomed, like their neighbors, to use, for correspondence with other countries, the cuneiform mode of writing.² These chiefs were accustomed to send from time to time a present to the Pharaoh, which the latter was pleased to regard as a tribute.³

They had, moreover, commercial relations with Egypt, and furnished it with cattle, chariots, and those splendid Cappadocian horses whose breed was celebrated down to the Greek period.

In the XXIst year of the reign of Ramses II of Egypt, his war with the Khâti was ended by a treaty. Not only was a perpetual truce declared between both peoples, but they agreed to

¹ Today, scholars believe they were a white race, possibly of Indo-European origin.

² These cuneiform writings of the Hittites have been deciphered. One tablet has been found that goes back to before 2500 B. C. to the time of Sargon I of Akkad.

³ One of the Tell-el-Amarna (Egypt) letters refers to presents of this kind, which the King of Khâti addresses to Amenothès IV to celebrate his enthronement and to ask him to maintain with himself the traditional good relations of their two families. (Part of Maspero's note.)

help each other at the first demand. "Should some enemy march against the countries subject to the great King of Egypt, and should he send to the great Prince of the Khâti, saying: 'Come, bring me forces against them,' the great Prince of the Khâti shall do as he is asked by the great King of Egypt, and the great Prince of the Khâti shall destroy his enemies. And if the great Prince of the Khâti shall prefer not to come himself, he shall send his archers and his chariots to the great King of Egypt to destroy his enemies." A similar clause ensured aid in return from Ramses to Khâtusaru, "his brother." The whole treaty was placed under the guarantee of the gods both of Egypt and of the Khâti, whose names were given at length: "Whoever shall fail to observe the stipulations let the thousand gods of Khâti and the thousand gods of Egypt strike his house, his land, and his servants. But he who shall observe the stipulations engraved on the tablet of silver, whether he belong to the Hittite people or whether he belong to the people of Egypt, as he has not neglected them, may the thousand gods of Khâti and the thousand gods of Egypt give him health, and grant that he may prosper, himself, the people of his house, and also his land and his servants." The treaty itself ends by a description of the plaque of silver on which it was engraved. It was, in fact, a facsimile in metal of one of those clay tablets on which the Babylonians inscribed their contracts. This treaty is the most ancient of all those of which the text has come down to us; its principal conditions were: perfect equality and reciprocity between the contracting sovereigns, an offensive and defensive alliance, and the extradition of criminals and refugees.⁴

⁴ This treaty is engraved on the outer wall of the temple of Karnak in Egypt.

That the Khâti were really the Hittites was proved conclusively in 1907 when excavators found a silver duplicate of this same treaty at Boghaz Keui in Asia Minor. The modern village of Boghaz Keui, according to Mr. Garstang, covers the ruins of what was the city of Pteria in the age of the Greeks, and in the time of the Hittites their capital city called Hattusas. See *The Hittite Empire* by John Garstang, 1929, and the account of Dr. Breasted's expedition in 1926, *Explorations in Central Anatolia, Season of 1926* (published in 1929).

All these very recent excavations have uncovered much queer hieroglyphic writing which no one, yet, has been able to read. There have been found lions sculptured on gateways, figures of a mother-goddess, queer, pronged, battle-axes, and remains of city walls, and of palaces. It is believed that the Hittites held sway in Asia Minor at least as far back as the ninth and tenth centuries B. C., and perhaps much earlier. Excavations may, any day, reveal much more to us of these people.

Special topic: The Two Processions (drawings on rocks two miles from Boghaz Keui) See Garstang and Breasted.

VII—ASSYRIA

Assyria seemed to regard Babylon with a deadly hatred. The capitals of the two countries were not more than some one hundred and eighty-five miles apart. Yet this narrow area was the scene of continual war.

The city of Assur covered a considerable area, and the outline formed by the remains of its walls is still discernible. It was dedicated to Anshar, the god of light, usually represented as an armed man, wearing the tiara and having the lower half of his body concealed by a feathered disk. He was supposed to hover continually over the world, hurling fiery darts at the enemies of his people and protecting his kingly worshippers under the shadow of his wings. The goddess associated with him as his wife had given her name, Ninâ, to Nineveh.

The city of Assur, placed at the very edge of the Mesopotamian desert, was exposed to the dry and burning winds which swept over the plains, so that by the end of the spring the heat rendered it almost intolerable as a residence. The Tigris, moreover, ran behind it, thus leaving it exposed to the attacks of the Babylonian armies, unprotected as it was by any natural fosse or rampart. Nineveh, on the other hand, was entrenched behind the Tigris and the Zab, and was thus secure from any sudden attack. Northerly and easterly winds prevailed during the summer, and the coolness of the night rendered the heat during the day more bearable. It became the custom for the kings to pass the most trying months of the year at Nineveh, but they did not venture to make it their habitual residence, and consequently Assur remained the official capital of the empire.

The army charged to carry out the will of the god Assur had not yet acquired the efficiency which it afterwards attained, yet it had been for some time one of the most formidable in the world. The blacksmith's art had made such progress among the Assyrians since the times of Thûtmosis III and Ramses II, that both the character and the materials of the armor were entirely changed.

While the Egyptian of old entered into the contest almost naked, and without other defence than a padded cap, a light shield, and a leather apron, the Assyrian of the new age set out for war almost dressed in metal. The pikemen and archers of whom the infantry at the line was composed wore a copper or iron helmet, and a leathern shirt covered with plates or scales of metal, which protected the body and the upper part of the arm. The pikemen were armed with a lance six feet long, a cutlass or short sword passed through the girdle, and an enormous shield. The chariots were heavier and larger than those of the Egyptians. They had high, strongly-made wheels with eight spokes, and the body of the vehicle rested directly on the axle; the panels were of solid wood, sometimes covered with embossed or carved metal, but frequently painted; they were further decorated sometimes with gold, silver, or ivory mountings, and with precious stones. The usual complement of charioteers was two to each vehicle, as in Egypt, but sometimes, as among the Khâti, there were three—one on the left to direct the horses, a warrior, and an attendant who protected the other two with his shield; on some occasions a fourth was added as an extra assistant.

If the army came to a river where there was neither ford nor bridge, they were not long in effecting a passage. Each soldier was provided with a skin, which, having inflated it with the strength of his lungs and closed the aperture, he embraced in his arms and cast himself into the stream. Partly by floating and partly by swimming, a whole regiment could soon reach the other side.

The monuments, which usually give few details of humble life, are remarkable for their complete reproductions of the daily scenes of the camp.

Babylon was,¹ by general acknowledgement, the ancient metropolis to which Assyria owed its whole civilization; it was the holy city whose gods and whose laws had served as a model for the gods and laws of Assyria; from its temples and its archives the Assyrian scribes had drawn such knowledge as they had of the

¹ We quote from *The Passing of the Empires*, by Sir Gaston Maspero, by kind permission of the D. Appleton-Century Company.

history of the ancient world, their religious doctrines and ceremonies. Babylon only consented to accept an alien master provided he bowed himself respectfully before its superiority, and was willing to forget that he was a stranger within its gates, and was ready to comply with its laws and masquerade as a Babylonian.

Tiglath-pileser III (or IV) c. 727 B. C. never dreamt, therefore, of treating the Babylonians as slaves, or of subordinating them to their Assyrian descendants, but left their liberties and territory alike unimpaired. He did not attempt to fuse into a single empire the two kingdoms which his ability had won for him; he kept them separate, and was content to be monarch of both on similar terms.²

Sargon II³ (c. 722-705 B. C.) had scarcely seated himself securely on a throne to which he was not the direct heir, when he was menaced by Elam and repudiated by Babylonia, and it remained to be seen whether his resources would prove equal to maintaining the integrity of his empire.

On a site a little to the northeast of Nineveh, he built a city of unrivalled magnificence, which he called by his own name Dur-Sharrukin (i.e. Sargon-burg). Its walls rest on a limestone substructure some three feet, six inches high, and rise fifty-seven feet above the ground; they are strengthened, every thirty yards or so, by battlemented towers which project thirteen feet from the face of the wall and stand sixteen feet higher than the ramparts. Access was gained to the interior by eight gates, two on each side of the square. Five allowed of the passage of beasts as well as men. It

² Yet Sayce says that under him "For the first time in history the idea of centralization was introduced into politics; the conquered provinces were organized under an elaborate bureaucracy at the head of which was the king, each district paying a fixed tribute and providing a military contingent... and Assyrian policy was directed towards the definite object of reducing the whole civilized world into a single empire. With this object after terrorizing Armenia and the Medes and breaking the power of the Hittites, he secured the high roads of commerce to the Mediterranean together with the Phoenician seaports and then made himself master of Babylonia. In 729 B. C. the summit of his ambition was attained, and he was invested with the sovereignty of Asia in the holy city of Babylon." *Ency. Brit.* 11th edition 3: 104.

³ He chose to take the name of the great Sargon who had lived two thousand years before him.

was through these that the peasants came in every morning, driving their cattle before them, or jolting along in wagons laden with fruit and vegetables. After passing the outposts, they crossed a paved courtyard, then made their way between the two towers through a vaulted passage over fifty yards long. At the entrance towered two colossal bulls with human heads, standing like sentinels. The arch supported by their mitred heads was ornamented by a course of enamelled bricks, on which genii faced one another in pairs. These were the mystic guardians of the city, who shielded it not only from the attacks of men, but also from invasions of evil spirits and pernicious diseases.

Sargon could overlook the whole city from the palace which he had built on both sides of the northeastern wall of the town, half within and half without the ramparts. At the city entrance were two flagstaffs bearing the royal standard, and two towers at the base of which were winged bulls and colossal figures of Gilgamesh crushing the lion. Two bulls of still more monstrous size stood sentry on each side of the gate, the arch was outlined by a course of enamelled bricks, while higher up, immediately beneath the battlements, was an enamelled mosaic showing the king in all his glory.

Each room had, as may still be seen, its own special purpose. There were cellars for wine and oil, with their rows of long oblong jars; then there were storerooms for implements of iron, which Place⁴ found full of rusty helmets, swords, pieces of armor, maces, and ploughshares; a little further on were rooms for the storage of copper weapons, enamelled bricks, and precious metals, and the king's private treasury, in which were hidden away the spoils of the vanquished or the regular taxes paid by his subjects; some fine bronze lions of marvellous workmanship and lifelike expression were found still shut up here.

The walls, of what were probably state apartments, were lined to a height of over nine feet from the floor with endless bas-reliefs, in greyish alabaster, picked out in bright colors, and illustrating the principal occupations in which the sovereign spent his

⁴ Victor Place, a French diplomat and Assyriologist.

days, such as audiences to ambassadors, hunting in the woods, sieges and battles. A few brief inscriptions interspersed above pictures of cities and persons indicated the names of the vanquished chiefs or the scenes of the various events portrayed; detailed descriptions were engraved on the back of the slabs facing the brick wall against which they rested.

The ziggurat rose to a height of some 141 feet above the esplanade. It had seven storeys dedicated to the gods of the seven planets.

The envious fates, however, allowed Sargon but little enjoyment of his later years; early in 705 B. C. he was assassinated by some soldier of alien birth, if I interpret rightly the mutilated text. Sennacherib was recalled in haste from the frontier, and was proclaimed king immediately on his arrival.

He looked upon his father's miserable ending as a punishment for some unknown transgression, and consulted the gods to learn what had aroused their anger, refusing to authorize the burial within the palace until the various expiatory rites suggested by the oracle had been duly performed.

Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.) did not consider it to his interest to assume the crown of Babylonia. The Babylonians were indignant at this slight and in less than two years they rebelled. The magnificent army left by Sargon was at Sennacherib's disposal, and summoning it at once into the field, he advanced on the town of Kish. His enemies were routed. Babylon threw open her gates, hoping no doubt that Sennacherib would at length resolve to imitate the precedent set by his father and retain the royal dignity. He did indeed, consent to remit the punishment for this first insurrection, and contented himself with pillaging the royal treasury and palace, but he did not deign to assume the crown.⁵

In the midst of his costly and absorbing wars, we may well wonder how Sennacherib found time and means to build villas or

⁵ Babylon remained in a state of revolt, until in 691 B. C. Sennacherib almost entirely destroyed the city. For his campaign against King Hezekiah of Judah see page 37. Compare also Byron's famous poem "The Destruction of Sennacherib."

temples; yet he is nevertheless, among the kings of Assyria, the monarch who has left us the largest number of monuments. He did not reside much at Dur-Sharrukin, neither did he complete the decoration of his father's palace there. He preferred to reside at Nineveh, and began by repairing the ancient fortifications; later on, he undertook the restoration of the whole city, with its avenues, canals, quays, gardens, and aqueducts. He erected a magnificent palace, with woodwork of fragrant cedar and cypress overlaid with gold and silver, panellings of sculptured marble and alabaster, and friezes and cornices in glazed tiles of brilliant coloring: he caused winged bulls of white alabaster and limestone statues of the gods to be hewn in the quarries of Balad near Nineveh.⁶ Eighteen aqueducts, carried across the country, brought an adequate supply of water to the city. An ancient and semi-subterranean canal was cleaned out, enlarged and repaired, and made capable of bringing water to the city doors from the springs of Mount Tas.⁷

The last years of Sennacherib had been embittered by the intrigues which usually gathered around a monarch enfeebled by age and incapable of bearing the cares of government with his former vigor. (His assassination by two of his sons was regarded by the Babylonians and the Jews as the just reward for his cruelties.)

One of the king's remaining sons, Esarhaddon, had already been nominated his successor 681 B. C. The mother of Esarhaddon was a Babylonian, and as soon as her son came into possession of

⁶ "Two lofty platforms along the Tigris front had served for the foundations of the palaces hitherto built, but the platforms had been wrecked and the palaces were in decay. Sennacherib restored and enlarged the northern platform now covered by the Kuyunjik mound and built his palace on the southwestern portion of it. It has been only partially excavated, though seventy-one rooms were opened, and it is the grandest architectural effort of Assyria. The bas-reliefs with which the walls are adorned are unrivalled in antiquity for variety of subject, breadth of composition, truth of presentation and artistic treatment." See *Ency. Brit.* 11th edition "Nineveh," by Rev. C. H. W. Johns.

⁷ Mount Tas is the group of hills enclosing the ravine of Bavian. These works are described in the Bavian inscription, of which they occupy the whole of the first part.

his inheritance, an impulse of filial piety moved him to restore to his mother's city its former rank of capital. Animated by the strong religious feelings⁸ which formed the groundwork of his character, Esarhaddon had begun his reign by restoring the sanctuaries which had been the cradle of the Assyrian religion, and his intentions thus revealed at the very outset, had won for him the sympathy of the Babylonians. The work of rebuilding Babylon and the temple of E-sagilla⁹ was indeed a gigantic undertaking, and demanded years of uninterrupted labor, but Esarhaddon pushed it forward, sparing neither gold, silver, costly stone, rare woods, or plates of enamel in its embellishment. He began to rebuild at the same time all the other temples and the two city walls, to clear and make good the canals, and to replant the sacred groves and the gardens of the palace. The inhabitants were encouraged to come back to their homes, and those who had been dispersed among distant provinces were supplied with clothes and food for their return journey. The complete defeat of Egypt (in 670 B. C.) filled not only Esarhaddon himself, but all Asia with astonishment. His return to Nineveh was a triumphal progress; travelling through Syria by short stages, he paraded his captives and trophies before the peoples and princes who had so long relied on the invincible power of the Pharaoh. Esarhaddon filled his palaces with furniture and woven stuffs, with vases of precious metal and sculptured ivories, with glass ornaments and statuettes looted from Memphis: his workers in marble took inspiration from the sphinxes of Egypt to modify the winged, human-headed lions upon which the columns of their palaces rested.

The question of the succession to the throne was still undecided. Convinced that it was impossible to unite Babylon and Nineveh permanently under the same ruler, Esarhaddon reluctantly decided to divide his kingdom into two parts—Assyria, the strongest portion, falling naturally to his eldest son, Assurbanipal, while Babylonia was assigned to Shamash-shumukîn, on condition

⁸ Esarhaddon's prayers to his chief god make him seem very much like a believer in one God.

⁹ The ancient temple of Merodach.

of his paying homage to his brother as suzerain. Esarhaddon died in the twelfth year of his reign. When we endeavor to conjure up his image before us, we fancy we are right in surmising that he was not cast in the ordinary mold of Assyrian monarchs. The records of his wars do not continually speak of rebels flayed alive, kings impaled before the gates of their cities, and whole populations decimated by fire and sword. Of all Assyrian conquerors he is almost the only one for whom the historian can feel any regard.

The two states enjoyed a nearly absolute equality during the opening years of Assurbanipal's reign. But with success, Assurbanipal's moderation gradually gave place to arrogance. In proportion as his military renown increased, he accentuated his supremacy, and accustomed himself to treat Babylon more and more as a vassal state. When therefore Shamash-shumukîn tried to make Babylon independent of Assyria, Assurbanipal besieged and conquered the city. The Assyrians laid waste the surrounding country with ruthless and systematic cruelty, burning the villages, razing to the ground isolated houses, destroying the trees, breaking down the dykes, and filling up the canals. Famine raged in Babylon, while pestilence spreading among the people mowed them down by thousands. Shamush-shumukîn, not willing to fall alive into the hands of his brother, shut himself up in his palace, and there immolated himself on a funeral pyre with his wives, his children, his slaves, and his treasures at the moment when his conquerors were breaking down the gates and penetrating into the palace precincts. The city presented a terrible spectacle, and shocked even the Assyrians, accustomed as they were to horrors of this sort. Most of the numerous victims to pestilence or famine lay about the streets or in the public squares, a prey to dogs and swine. Assurbanipal proclaimed himself king (c. 635 B. C.) in his brother's stead, took the hands of Bel, delegated the administration of Babylonian affairs to one of his high officers of State, and re-entered Nineveh with an amount of spoil almost equalling that taken from Egypt after the sack of Thebes.

The palace of Sennacherib, though it had been built scarcely

fifty years before, was already beginning to totter on its foundations; Assurbanipal entirely remodeled and restored it. This palace was one of the largest and most ornate ever built by the rulers of Assyria. True, the decoration does not reveal any novel process or theme; we find therein merely the usual scenes of battle or of the chase, but they are designed and executed with a skill to which the sculptors of Nineveh had never before attained. The animals, in particular, are portrayed with a light and delicate touch—the wild asses pursued by hounds, or checked while galloping at full speed by the cast of the lasso; the herds of goats and gazelles hurrying across the desert; the wounded lioness, which raises herself with a last dying effort to roar at the beaters.

There have been discovered in several of the ruined chambers of his palaces the remains of a regular library, which must originally have contained thousands of clay tablets,¹⁰ all methodically arranged and catalogued for his use. A portion of them furnish us first-hand with the records of his reign, and include letters exchanged with provincial governors, augural predictions, consultation of oracles, observations made by royal astrologers, standing orders, accounts of income and expenditure, even the reports of physicians in regard to the health of members of the royal family or of the royal household: these documents reveal to us the whole machinery of government in actual operation, and we almost seem to witness the secret mechanism by which the kingdom was maintained in activity. Other tablets contain authentic copies of works which were looked upon as classics in the sanctuaries of the Euphrates. The majority of them were treatises in the sciences for which the Babylonians had been famous from time immemorial; they included collections of omens, in which the mystical meaning of each phenomenon and its influence on the destinies of the world were explained by examples borrowed from the Annals of world-renowned conquerors, such as Naramsin and Sargon of Agadê; then there were formulae for exorcising evil spirits from the

¹⁰ 22,000 tablets have already been uncovered, one of which was written in 2000 B. C.

bodies of the possessed, and against phantoms, vampires, and ghosts, the recognized causes of all disease; prayers and psalms, which had to be repeated before the gods in order to obtain pardon for sin; and histories of divinities and kings from the time of the creation down to the latest date. Among these latter were several versions of the epic of Gilgames, the story of Etana, of Adapa, and many others; and we may hope to possess all that the Assyrians knew of the old Babylonian literature in the seventh century B. C. as soon as the excavators have unearthed from the mound Kouyunjik all the tablets, complete or fragmentary, which still lie hidden there.¹¹

The East was ever a land of kaleidoscopic changes and startling dramatic incidents. No kingdom ever shone with brighter splendor, or gave a greater impression of prosperity, than the kingdom of Assyria in the days succeeding its triumphs over Elam and Arabia: precisely at this point the monuments and other witnesses of its activity fail us. Half a century rolls by, during which we have a dim perception of the subdued crash of falling empires, and of the trampling of armies in fierce fight; then the curtain rises on an utterly different drama. We no longer hear of Assyria and its kings; their palaces are in ruins. The nations which erewhile disputed the supremacy with Assyria have either suffered a like eclipse, or have fallen like Egypt and Southern Syria into the rank of second-rate powers. It is Chaldea which is now in the van of the nations, in company with Lydia and with Media, whose advent to imperial power no one would have ventured to predict forty or fifty years before.

¹¹ Special topic: "The latest excavations at Kunyunjik."

VIII—LATER BABYLONIA (CHALDEA)

[Nineveh, the capital of Assyria was destroyed in 606 B. C. by the combined forces of Scythians, Medes and Persians (tribes of the plateau of Iran) and Kaldi (Chaldeans), a people who had lived southeast of the Persian gulf. Chaldea was therefore what had once been Babylonia and Assyria.]

The kings of the second Babylonian empire (Chaldea) do not seem to have been the impetuous conquerors which we fancied them to be. We see them as they are depicted to us in the visions of the Hebrew prophets, who, regarding them and their nation as a scourge in the hands of God, had no colors vivid enough or images sufficiently terrible to portray them. They had blotted out Nineveh from the list of cities, humiliated Pharaoh, and subjugated Syria, and they had done all this almost at their first appearance in the field—such a feat as Assyria and Egypt in the plenitude of their strength had been unable to accomplish: they had moreover destroyed Jerusalem and carried Judah into captivity. There is nothing astonishing in the fact that this Nebuchadrezzar, whose history is known to us almost entirely from Jewish sources, should appear as a fated force let loose upon the world. But his campaigns in Syria and Africa, of which the echoes transmitted to us still seem so formidable, were not nearly so terrible in reality as those in which Elam had perished a century previously;¹ they were, moreover, the only conflicts which troubled the peace of his reign.

Nebuchadrezzar was, after all, not so much a warrior as a man of peace, and he took advantage of the long intervals of quiet between his campaigns to complete the extensive works which more than anything else have won for him his renown. During the century which had preceded the fall of Nineveh, Babylonia had had several bitter experiences; it had suffered almost entire destruction at the hands of Sennacherib; it had been given up to pillage by Assurbanipal, not to mention the sieges and ravages it had sustained in the course of continual revolts. The canals had become choked

¹ Elam, a part of what was later Persia, was conquered by Sennacherib. Nebuchadrezzar conquered Jerusalem in 586 B. C. and carried off so many captives to Babylon that it was called "The Great Captivity."

with mud, the banks had fallen in, and the waters, no longer kept under control, had overflowed the land, and the plains, long since reclaimed for cultivation had returned to their original condition of morasses and reed-beds; in some parts the aspect of the country must have been desolate and neglected as at the present day, and the work accomplished by twenty generations had to be begun entirely afresh. Nabopolassar² already had raised many earth-works in both the capital and the provinces. But a great deal more still remained to be done, and Nebuchadrezzar pushed forward the work planned by his father, and carried it to completion undeterred and undismayed by any difficulties. The combined system of irrigation and navigation introduced by the kings of the first Babylonian empire, twenty centuries previously, was ingeniously repaired; the drainage of the country between the Tigris and Euphrates was regulated by means of subsidiary canals and a network of dykes; the canals surrounding Babylon or intersecting in the middle of the city were cleaned out, and a waterway was secured for navigation from one river to the other.

It was needful to provide against the possibility of the barbarous tribes of Iran being let loose upon Babylon, and attempting to inflict on her the fate they had brought upon Nineveh. Nebuchadrezzar, therefore, erected across the northern side of the isthmus between the two rivers a great embankment, faced with bricks cemented together with bitumen, called the Wall of Media; on both sides of it four or five deep trenches were excavated, which were passable on raised causeways or by bridges of boats, so arranged as to be easily broken up in case of invasion. Nebuchadrezzar multiplied the number of the dykes, and so arranged them that the whole country between the suburbs of Borsippa and Babylon could be inundated at will. Babylon itself formed as it were the citadel in the midst of these enormous outlying fortifications. A triple rampart surrounded it and united it to Borsippa. A moat of great width, with banks of masonry, communicating with the Euphrates, washed the foot of the outer wall; behind

² father and predecessor of Nebuchadrezzar. The latter is often called Nebuchadnezzar.

this wall rose Nimitti-bel, the true city wall, to a height of more than ninety feet above the level of the plain; finally, behind Nimitti-bel ran a platform forming a last barrier behind which the garrison could rally before finally owning itself defeated and surrendering the city. Large square towers rose at intervals along the face of the walls, to the height of some eighteen feet above the battlements:³ a hundred gates fitted with bronze-plated doors, which could be securely shut at need, gave access to the city.

The royal palace, built in the marvelously short space of fifteen days, was celebrated for its hanging gardens,⁴ where the ladies of the harem might walk unveiled, secure from vulgar observation. No trace of all these extensive works remains at the present day. Some scattered fragments of crumbling walls alone betray the site of the great ziggurat, a few bas-reliefs are strewn over the surface of the ground, and a lion of time-worn stone, lying on its back in a depression of the soil, is perhaps the last survivor of those which kept watch, according to custom, at the gates of the palace.⁵

³ The remains of the gate of Ishtar still stand—one of the very few Babylonian buildings of which any appreciable parts still survive.

⁴ So great were these considered that the Greeks named them one of the Seven Wonders of the World. The gardens seem to have been laid out on the flat roof of the palace. Built as the palace was of bricks of clay, the marvel is that so much earth and water could have been supported by the walls. Little besides tradition is known of the gardens. Dr. Koldewey, director of the German excavations at Babylon, unearthed some massive ruins which he believes were the arched sub-structure of the gardens.

⁵ Compare Shelley's sonnet:

I met a traveller from an antique land
Who said: "Two vast and trunkless legs of stone
Stand in the desert. Near them on the sand,
Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose frown
And wrinkled lip and sneer of cold command
Tell that its sculptor well those passions read
Which yet survive, stamped on these lifeless things,
The hand that mocked them and the heart that fed.
And on the pedestal these words appear:
'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:
Look on my works, ye mighty, and despair.'
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare
The lone and level sands stretch far away."

Nebuchadrezzar died in 562 B. C. A few years later Chaldeæ was conquered by Cyrus, the first great ruler of Persia,

IX—ANCIENT CHINA¹

China,² including what it still claims to control, Mongolia, Tibet, and eastern Turkestan, covers about 4,000,000 square miles; (the United States without Alaska has about 3,000,000 sq. mi.). China Proper, however, has only about 1,500,000 sq. mi. Its sea-coast is 5,000 miles long. The population of China is roughly estimated at 400,000,000, and some of the eastern provinces are very densely peopled, Shantung having 680 people to a square mile.

Although so large and divided by mountains (some 20,000 feet high), by great rivers, by high plateaus, and by climatic and racial differences, China has held itself together longer than any of the other ancient empires.

No one knows where Chinese civilization originated. Most scholars no longer believe that it came from Egypt, Babylonia, or India. Some have suggested that it may have come from an ancient pre-historic Asiatic civilization which modern excavators are unearthing.

The Chinese themselves believe that their history goes back to nearly 3000 B. C.; but much is less history than legend.

The early Chinese were probably an agricultural people in a North China river valley. They believed that barbarians lived south of them; nor was the south closely united with the north until the seventh and eighth centuries.

Their first three dynasties were the Hsia, the Shang and the Chou. The Shang dynasty may go back to somewhere between 1600 B. C. and 1200 B. C. Excavations in 1899 of inscribed bones, revealed the primitive Chinese writing, and proved that possibly more than half of the names of the Shang rulers are authentic. Some, however, believe this writing to refer to the later Chou reigns. It is known that the Chinese of that time had pigs, dogs, fowls, elephants and chariots, and that they wrote on bones, ivory, and bronze, and that possibly they wrote with ink, on bamboo.

The Chou dynasty, the Chinese say, came to power in 1122

¹ With the fall of Chaldea, we pass from the countries near the two rivers, and from their Semetic peoples. Before studying Persia, let us glance way to the east of the Euphrates to what we today call China. So far as we know, the Semites knew nothing of the peoples of Siberia, Tibet, and China. Modern study has so changed historical beliefs regarding China, that we quote no historian. This brief outline, supplemented by special topics, may give the pupil a little idea of how great the subject is.

² or Sin, or Chin, or Sinoe, or Cathay, or Kitai.

B. C.; it lasted until about 200 B. C. Its territory was larger, it had more commerce, and more wars. *Shih Ching*, or *Classic of Poetry*, a poetic anthology, which is said to be the most ancient trustworthy record, dates back to the ninth or eighth century B. C.

The Chinese *Empire* began under the Ch'in and Han dynasties, 221 B. C. to 220 A. D. It now had apparently more contact with other nations, for its silks, furs, and cinnamon went to many countries; and in return it imported horses, ivory, wool and linen cloth, and precious stones—even diamonds.

From 220 A.D. to 589 was a period of foreign invasions and war. From 589 to 618 the Sui dynasty reigned, and from 618–907 the Tang dynasty.

During the “five dynasties” and the Sung reign 960–1278 A. D. civilization developed greatly along the lines of printing, porcelain-making, painting, and literature.

The chief event to us in the reign of the foreign Mongol invaders (1279–1368) is the visit of the Polo brothers to China in the thirteenth century.

It was the son of a Chinese laborer, who drove the last of the Mongols from the country and established the Ming dynasty which continued to 1644 when the Manchu dynasty came to power to last until 1838.

Confucius, probably the greatest name in Chinese history, lived possibly from 551 to 479 B. C. Much of the writing attributed to him is undoubtedly his. We give a few quotations.

Study without thought is vain: thought without study is ignorance.

To know what we know, and to know what we do not know, that is understanding.

A gentleman wishes to be slow to speak and quick to act.

What I do not wish to have done to me, I likewise wish not to do to others. Love is not to do unto others what we would not they should do unto us.

A man to whom three years of study have borne no fruit would be hard to find.

A gentleman's life leads upward; a vulgar life leads down.

Study as though the time were short, as one who fears to lose.

A gentleman has three things to guard against. In the days of thy youth, ere thy strength is steady, beware of lust. When manhood is reached, in thy fulness of strength, beware of strife. In old age, when thy strength is broken, beware of greed.

A gentleman has nine aims. To see clearly; to understand what he hears; to be warm in manner, dignified in bearing, faithful in speech, painstaking at work; to ask when in doubt; in anger to think of difficulties; in sight of gain to remember right.

Special topics: The first silk; The Chinese firecracker (gunpowder; Chinese printing, poems, dramas, novels, porcelain, cloisonné, temples, art; The Great Wall; Marco Polo; Friar John; Chinese Buddhism; Chinese Mohammedanism; Recent excavations in China.

One of the best books on China is: *The Chinese, Their History and Culture*, by Kenneth Scott Latourette, Macmillan, 1934.

X—ANCIENT INDIA

The country including Burma¹ covers nearly two million square miles, and has a population of nearly 300,000,000. Its Himalayas on the north include some of the highest peaks in the world, averaging 19,000 ft. Flowing down from these are the three great rivers, the Indus, the Brahmaputra, and the Ganges, with their vast plains. In the southern peninsula is the high tableland often spoken of as the Deccan.

The Vedic hymns of the Aryans² long were considered the earliest historic evidence concerning India. But modern excavation has unearthed a pre-Aryan race that had a civilization in 3000 B. C. in India, as old as the Sumerian in Babylonia.

At Mohenjo-dâro on the lower Indus, have been found ruins of a city built of brick five thousand years ago. The houses had wells into which was filtered the river water; some had bathrooms, and even a rubbish chute which led to a bin outside. There are ruins of a great pillared hall, and of a great public bath. The people raised wheat and barley, had cattle, pigs and fowls; used gold, silver, copper, and lead; used the potter's wheel, engraved seals like those of the Babylonians, wove wool and cotton cloth, and did some work in sculpture. But the picture writing of their time has not yet been deciphered, for it is not like the Sanscrit. Like the Aegeans, they worshipped a mother-goddess.

The Rig Veda, the ancient collection of writings of India, dates from 1500 to 1000 B. C. It mentions the Aryas (nobles) and the Dasyas or Dâsas (black) who became slaves. Some of the Vedic hymns may have been handed down for centuries and may have been sung while the white Aryans were crossing the Himalayas on their way south into India.

¹ As in the case of China, we do not quote from classic historians, but give a brief outline, which supplemented by special topics, may invite further study.

² The Aryans are that part of the Caucasian or White race, to which we belong. We call them also Indo-Europeans, because, coming apparently from somewhere north of India, part of them went southward, crossing the Himalayas into India, and part went westward into Persia and into Europe.

These Aryans were a simple people, living by tribes in small villages, and cultivating the earth. Their chief gods were the Sun, Fire, Indra the thunder, Varuna the sky, and the goddesses Ushâs, the shining dawn, and Sarasvati, the goddess of rivers and later of wisdom.

Later than the Rig Veda are the Vedas and Brâhmanas of 1000 B. C. and on.

The religious teacher, Siddharta or Gautama, called Buddha (the enlightened), who lived in the sixth century B. C., was the founder of Buddhism.

Something of India in 327 B. C. is learned from the Greek records of the time of Alexander. From rock inscriptions we learn of the reign of Asoka 274–232 B. C. renowned among Buddhists, and apparently ruler over a vast territory. In the following centuries India was invaded by Greeks, Scythians, Chinese, and Mohammedans. From then on there is much material for historical study.

The age of discoveries, and the coming of Portuguese, Dutch and English explorers to India in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, brought India under European influence, and in the time of Queen Elizabeth the East India company was founded.

Special topics; The epics—The Ramayana and the Mahabharata; Ancient carvings; Kipling's India; The caste system; Superstitions; Monsoons; Famines; Floods; Hindu poetry; etc., etc.

XI—ANCIENT PERSIA

The Median empire is the least known of all those which held sway for a time over the destinies of a portion of Western Asia. Whereas at Babylon, original documents abound, enabling us to put together, feature by feature, the picture of its ancient civilization and of the chronology of its kings, we possess no contemporary monuments of Ecbatana to furnish direct information as to its history. To form any idea of the Median kings or their people, we are reduced to haphazard notices gleaned from the chroniclers of other lands, retailing a few isolated facts, anecdotes, legends, and conjectures, and, as these materials reach us through the medium of the Babylonians or the Greeks of the fifth or sixth century B. C., the picture which we endeavor to compose from them is always imperfect or out of perspective. We seemingly catch glimpses of ostentatious luxury, of a political and military organization, and a method of government analogous to that which prevailed at later periods among the Persians, but more imperfect, ruder, and nearer barbarism—a Persia in fact in the rudimentary stage, with its ruling spirit and essential characteristics as yet undeveloped. The machinery of state had doubtless been adopted almost in its entirety from the political organizations which obtained in the kingdoms of Assyria, Elam, and Chaldea.

But once we reach the inner life of the people, we find in the religion they profess—mingled with some borrowed traits—a world of unfamiliar myths and dogmas of native origin. It was a religion common to all the Iranians, the Persians as well as the Medes, and legend honored as its first law giver and expounder an ancient prophet named Zarathustra, known to us as Zoroaster.¹ The only certain thing we know concerning him is his name; all else is mythical, poetic, or religious fiction.

¹ (From Maspero's text) Most classical writers relegated Zoroaster to some remote age of antiquity—thus he is variously said to have lived six thousand years before the death of Plato, five thousand before the Trojan war, one thousand before Moses, and six hundred before Xerxes' campaign against Athens; while some few only affirmed that he had lived at a comparatively recent period, and made him out a disciple of the philosopher Pythagoras, who flourished about the middle of the fifth century B. C.

Families consecrated to the service of the altar formed a special tribe, that of the Magi. All the Magi were not necessarily devoted to the service of religion, but all who did so devote themselves sprang from the Magian tribe; The Avesta,² in its oldest form, was the sacred book of the Magi.

The Creator was described as "the whole circle of the heavens," "the most steadfast among the gods," for "he clothes himself with the solid vault of the firmament as his raiment," "the most beautiful, the most intelligent, he whose members are most harmoniously proportioned; his body was the light and the sovereign glory, the sun and the moon were his eyes." He was named Ahur-masdao or Ahura-mazda, the omniscient lord.

Ahura mazda and his colleagues had not, as was the fashion among the Assyrians and Egyptians, either temples or tabernacles, and though they were represented sometimes under human or animal forms, and even in some cases on bas-reliefs, yet no one ever ventured to set up in their sanctuaries those so-called animated or prophetic statues to which the majority of nations had rendered or were rendering their solicitous homage. Altars, however, were erected on the tops of hills, in palaces, or in the centre of cities, on which fires were kindled in honor of the inferior deities or of the supreme god himself.³ Two altars were usually set up together, and they are thus found here and there among the ruins, as at the necropolis of Persepolis, where a pair of such altars exist; these are cut, each out of a single block, in a rocky mass which rises some thirteen feet above the level of the surrounding plain. Those altars on which burned a perpetual fire were not left exposed to the open air: they would have run too great a risk of contracting impurities. They were enclosed in slight structures, well protected by walls, and attaining in some cases considerable dimensions, or in pavilion-shaped edifices of stone adorned with columns. The recognized offering consisted of flowers, bread, fruit, and perfumes, but these were often accompanied, as in all ancient religions, by a

² Special topic: *The Avesta*, the sacred writings of Persia.

³ The followers of Zoroaster are therefore often called "Fire-worshippers."

bloody sacrifice: the sacrifice of a horse was considered the most efficacious, but an ox, a cow, a sheep, a camel, an ass, or a stag was frequently offered: in certain circumstances, especially when it was desired to conciliate the favor of the god of the underworld,⁴ a human victim, probably as a survival of very ancient rites, was preferred. The king, whose royal position made him the representative of Ahura-mazdâ on earth, was, in fact, a high priest, and was himself able to officiate at the altar, but no one else could dispense with the mediation of the Magi.

Although no more illustrious name than that of Cyrus occurs in the list of the founders of mighty empires, the history of no other has suffered more disfigurement from the imagination of his own subjects or from the rancour of the nations he had conquered. As far as we can ascertain, we gather that Kurush, known to us as Cyrus, succeeded his father as ruler of Anshân about 559 or 558 B. C., and that he revolted against Astyages⁵ in 553 or 552 B. C., and defeated him. The Median army thereupon seizing its own leader, delivered him into the hands of the conqueror: Ecbatana was taken and sacked, and the empire fell at one blow, or more properly speaking, underwent a transformation (550 B. C.). The transformation was, in fact, an internal revolution in which the two peoples of the same race changed places. The name of the Medes lost nothing of the prestige which it enjoyed in foreign lands, but that of the Persians was henceforth united with it, and shared its renown: like Astyages and his predecessors, Cyrus and his successors reigned equally over the two leading branches of the ancient Iranian stock, but whereas the former had been kings of the Medes and Persians, the latter became henceforth kings of the Persians and Medes. The change effected was so natural that their nearest neighbors, the Chaldeans, showed no signs of uneasiness at the outset. They confined themselves to the bare registration of the fact in their annals at the appointed date, without comment.

⁴ Ahriman, god of darkness and evil.

⁵ king of the Medes.

The downfall of Croesus,⁶ marked a decisive era in the world's history. His army was the only one, from the point of numbers and organization, which was a match for that of Cyrus, and from the day of its dispersion it was evident that neither Egypt nor Chaldaea had any chance of victory on the battlefield. The whole of Asia, and that part of Africa which had been the oldest cradle of human civilization, were now to pass into the hands of one man and form a single empire, for the benefit of the new race which was issuing forth in irresistible strength from the recesses of the Iranian tableland. Cyrus had spent ten years in compassing the downfall of Nabonidus,⁷ and, calculating that that of Amasis⁸ would require no less a period of time, he set methodically to work on the organization of his recently acquired territory; the cities of Phoenicia acknowledged him as their suzerain, and furnished him with what had hitherto been a coveted acquisition, a fleet. These preliminaries had apparently been already accomplished, when the movements of the barbarians suddenly made his presence in the far East imperative. He hurried thither, and was mysteriously lost to sight. (529 B. C.) . . .

Even the inhabitants of those countries which had been longest subject to the Persian sway did not receive the new sovereign⁹ favorably. Darius found himself, therefore, under the necessity of conquering his dominions one after the other. A man of less energetic character and calm judgment would have lost his head at the beginning of the struggle, when almost every successive week brought him news of a fresh rebellion. Darius, however, from the very beginning knew how to single out the important points upon which to deal such vigorous blows as would insure him the victory with the least possible delay. He saw that Babylon, with its numerous population, its immense wealth and prestige,

⁶ the very rich king of Lydia, in Asia Minor, conquered by Cyrus in 546 B. C.

⁷ successor of Nebuchadrezzar in Chaldaea.

⁸ ruler of Egypt. Egypt was conquered by Cyrus's son, Cambyses, in 525 B. C.
Special topic: The Tomb of Cyrus.

⁹ Darius, successor to Cambyses, son of Cyrus.

and its memory of recent supremacy, was the real danger to his empire, and he never relaxed his hold on it until it was subdued, leaving his generals to deal with the other nations, the Medes included. The event justified his decision. When once Babylon had fallen, the remaining rebels were no longer a source of fear.

After consummating his victories, Darius caused an inscription in commemoration of them to be carved on the rocks in the pass of Bagistana (Behistun), one of the most frequented routes leading from the basin of the Tigris to the tableland of Iran. There his figure is still to be seen standing, with his foot resting on the prostrate body of an enemy, and his hand raised in the attitude of one addressing an audience; an inscription, written in the three official languages of the court, recounts at full length his mighty deeds.¹⁰

The whole empire was now obedient to the will of one man, but the ordeal from which it had recently escaped showed how loosely the elements of it were bound together, and with what facility they could be disintegrated. The system of government in force hitherto was that introduced into Assyria by Tiglath-pileser III, which had proved so eminently successful in the time of Sargon II and his descendants; Babylon and Ecbatana had inherited it from Nineveh, and Persepolis had in turn adopted it from Ecbatana and Babylon. It had always been open to objections, of which by no means the least was the great amount of power and independence accorded by it to the provincial governors. It must have seemed far from prudent to set governors invested with almost regal powers over countries so distant that a decree dispatched from the palace might take several weeks to reach its destination.

Darius carefully abstained from any attempt at unifying the different elements in each province: not only did he allow vassal republics, and tributary kingdoms and nations to subsist side by

¹⁰ The fact that the inscription was in the old Persian or Susian, the Babylonian, and the later Persian enabled Sir Henry Rawlinson, in 1835-1850, to decipher the Babylonian cuneiform writing. See p. 22.

side, but he took care that each should preserve its own dynasty, language, writing, customs, religion, and peculiar legislation, besides the right to coin money stamped with the name of its chief or its civic symbol. The Greek cities of the coast maintained their own peculiar constitutions. In the years of peace which succeeded the troubled opening of his reign, that is from 519 to 515 B. C., Darius divided the whole empire into satrapies whose number varied at different periods of his reign from twenty to twenty-three, and even twenty-eight. In each province he installed three officials independent of each other, but each in direct communication with himself—a satrap, a general, and a secretary of state. The satraps were chosen from any class in the nation, from among the poor as well as from among the wealthy, from foreigners as well as from Persians; but the most important satrapies were bestowed only on persons allied by birth or marriage with the Achaemenids.¹¹ They were not appointed for any prescribed period, but continued in office during the king's pleasure. They exercised absolute authority in all civil matters, and maintained a court, a bodyguard, palaces, and extensive parks, or *paradises*, where they indulged in the pleasures of the chase; they controlled taxation, administered justice, and possessed the power of life and death.

All three officials were kept in constant communication with the court by relays of regular couriers, who carried their despatches on horseback, or on camels, from one end of Asia to the other, in the space of a few weeks. The most celebrated of the post-roads was that which ran from Sardes to Susa through Lydia and Phrygia, crossing the Halys, traversing Cappadocia and Cilicia, and passing through Armenia and across the Euphrates, until at length, after passing through Matîênê and the country of the Cosseans, it reached Elam. This main route was divided into one hundred and eleven stages which were performed by couriers on horseback and partly in ferryboats in eighty-four days. Other routes, of

¹¹ the ancient royal family to which Cyrus and Darius belonged.

which we have no particular information, led to Egypt, Media, Bactria, and India, and by their means the imperial officials in the capital were kept fully informed of all that took place in the most distant parts of the empire. As an extra precaution, the king sent out annually certain officers, called his "eyes" or his "ears," who appeared on the scene when they were least expected, and investigated the financial or political situation, reformed abuses in the administration, and reprimanded or even suspended the government officials; they were accompanied by a body of troops to support their decisions, whose presence invested their counsels with the strongest sanction.

By continual conquests, the Persians were now reduced to only two outlets for their energies, in two opposite directions—in the east towards India, in the west towards Greece. At one moment, about 512 B. C., it is possible that they pushed forward towards the east. From the Iranian plateau they beheld from afar the immense plain of the Punjab. Darius invaded this territory, and made himself master of extensive districts which he formed into a new satrapy, that of India, but subsequently, renouncing all idea of pushing eastward as far as the Ganges, he turned his steps towards the southeast. A fleet, placed under the command of a Greek admiral, Scylax, descended the Indus by order of the king; subjugating the tribes who dwelt along the banks as he advanced, Scylax at length reached the ocean, on which he ventured forth, undismayed by the tides, and proceeded in a westerly direction, exploring, in less than thirty months, the shores of Gedrosia and Arabia. The circumstances which prevented the Persians from following up this preliminary success are unknown; but certain it is that they arrested their steps when they had touched merely the outskirts of the basin of the Indus.

Inquisitive, bold, and restless, greedy of gain, and inured to the fatigues and dangers of travel, the Greeks were to be encountered everywhere—in Asia Minor, Egypt, Syria, Babylon, and even Persia itself. The very ardor of their temperament, and their consequent pride, their impatience of all regular control,

their habitual proneness to civic strife, and to sanguinary quarrels with the inhabitants of the neighboring cities, rendered them the most dangerous subjects imaginable to govern, and their loyalty very uncertain. It was not then, as is still asserted, the mere caprice of a despot which brought upon the Greek world the scourge of the Persian wars, but the imperious necessity of security, which obliges well-organized empires to subjugate in turn all the tribes and cities which cause constant trouble on its frontiers. Darius, who was already ruler of a good third of the Hellenic world, from Trebizond to Barca, saw no other means of keeping what he already possessed, and of putting a stop to the incessant fomentation of rebellion in his own territories, than to conquer Greece as he had conquered her colonies, and to reduce to subjection the whole of European Hellas.

XII—THE AEGEANS

For hundreds of years, most people had supposed that the first race to live in the land we call Greece were Greeks. But about fifty years ago it was discovered that other peoples had lived there long before the Greeks.

A little grocer's boy in Germany named Heinrich Schliemann had heard all about Homer's heroes and had longed to see the city of Troy. Of course, that city had long ages before, been covered up by the dust and sand of thousands of years. But the boy wanted to dig down until he could see the ancient city. This would cost much money; so he had to wait until he grew up and had earned and saved enough to carry out his plan.

Years passed, but he never forgot his boyhood desire. At last, in 1870, he went to the northwestern corner of Asia Minor, to the modern mound of Hissarlik, where he thought Troy had once stood. Here he hired diggers. But as the mound was 162 ft. high, they dug down sixteen feet from the top before coming to even a stone wall. It was going to be a tremendous task. Finally with permission from the Turkish government, Schliemann set eighty workmen at regular excavation work. More walls were found; then sculptured stone, and gold diadems, and rings, and bracelets. Work was continued with many interruptions, until the diggers reached the bed-rock upon which the mound had been formed. They had unearthed ruins that belonged to nine successive periods. The lowest ruins—those of the so-called "first city" were those of village houses with stone foundations. No one knows whether the people who lived there then were from Asia or Europe. But they kept cattle, sheep, pigs, and goats, and fished, and in some cases had rebuilt their houses.

The next upper ruins or "the second city" had a strong outer wall of stone, eight and a half meters high, with a brick rampart above it. This city seems to have been used for several hundred years and shows buildings rebuilt twice. The pottery of that time was of red clay—sometimes made with a potter's wheel and baked in an oven. Before the end of this "second city" black pottery

was made. They also had polished green stone axes, gold and silver diadems, ear-rings, lapislazuli, ivory and marble idols. Scholars think that this second city goes back to a period between 2400 B. C. and 1900 or 1800 B. C. It seems to have been destroyed in 1900 or 1800 B. C.

The ruins on top of this "second city" are spoken of as Troy III and IV but are remains of merely two poor villages.

Troy V may have been the beginning of what scholars call the "sixth city." Troy VI was the one in which people lived in Homer's time. It was much larger than Troy II, had great fortifications and marks of a great civilization.

Dr. Schliemann had found that the city of Homer's time instead of being the oldest, was built on the ruins of five other cities. A pre-Homeric people had been discovered—a people that up to Schliemann's time scholars had known almost nothing about. We call them Aegeans because we have found their remains in the islands and coasts of the Aegean Sea.

From Troy Dr. Schliemann went to the mainland of Greece, and began excavations in Mycenae and Tiryns. Here, palaces, paintings, sculptures, and gold and silver ornaments were found which gave the world still more knowledge of this early people who lived in Greece before the Greeks came there.

But it was not until after 1900—Dr. Schliemann died in 1890—that a great deal more was learned about these people. Sir Arthur Evans in 1900 began excavations in the island of Crete. At Knossos, he found remains that some scholars think go back to 5000 B. C. As Dr. Glotz¹ writes, "Sir Arthur Evans has brought to light a collection of monuments without its like in the world—the Great Palace, the Little Palace, the Royal Villa; he has called up a society which began to exist in the sixth millenium before Christ, and progressed continuously until it reached its apogee in the second millenium."

Since then, more and more scholars have become interested in Cretan and other Aegean excavations. You can get books and

¹ *Aegean Civilization* p. 14, printed by kind permission of Messrs. Kegan Paul, London and A. A. Knopf, New York,

pictures that will tell you all about the wonderful discoveries that are being made in Crete.

These pre-Greeks at the height of their civilization had great palaces, beautifully painted walls, fine gold and silver work, and very artistic pottery. The women wore dresses with many flounces or ruffles, and much decoration. At Knossos, a game board was found something like that used for checkers or chess. It is nearly a yard long and over half a yard wide and has an ivory frame inlaid with gold and crystal and silver.

There have been found tablets bearing a language written in ink (not cut with a stylus like the Babylonian). But no one yet has been able to read it. When, perhaps, some tablet or stone is found bearing two languages—for instance the Aegean and Egyptian, or the Aegean and Babylonian—then some scholar may be able to decipher the Aegean language, and then we shall probably find out a great deal more about this early people.

We are sure for several reasons that these Aegeans were not early Greeks. One reason is that their writing is not like the Greek. Another reason is that their religion was so different. The Aegeans seem to have worshipped a sort of mother goddess. Many representations of her surrounded by snakes or doves have been found. But the Greeks worshipped the god Zeus and many other gods; and doves and snakes were not associated with them.

Another reason we are sure that the Aegeans were not Greeks is that the pottery of the Aegeans is so much more beautiful than that of the first Greeks. The Aegeans painted dolphins, flying fishes, trees, lilies, bending reeds, bulls and wild goats, and people playing games, or walking in processions, and painted all these in so life-like and natural a way that their art is very different from that of other early peoples.

But although so much has been found out about the Aegeans, there is a great deal that we do not yet know about them. We do not know where they came from; though some say they came from the north. We do not know what became of them. Between 1400 B. C. and 1200 B. C. they seem to have been destroyed.

Perhaps it was a civil war, perhaps a war with the early savage Greeks—the Achaians and Dorians—.Whatever it was, it seems to have largely destroyed the Cretan civilization. As Dr. Glotz says, “over the blackened ruins, buried by the centuries, three thousand years were to pass in the silence of death,” for not until 1876 did modern people know of their existence two or three thousand years before our Christian era.

XIII—GREECE

Greece¹ Proper is among the most mountainous territories in Europe. In point of fact there are so vast a number of hills and crags of different magnitude and elevation, that a comparatively small proportion of the surface is left for level ground.

It will be seen that Greece, considering its limited total extent, offers but little means for internal communication among its various inhabitants. Each village or township, occupying its plain with the enclosing mountains, supplied its own wants, while the transport of commodities by land was sufficiently difficult to discourage greatly any regular commerce with its neighbors. Greece Proper constituted only a fraction of the entire Hellenic world, during the historical age: there were the numerous islands, and still more numerous colonies, all located on distinct points of the coast, in the Black Sea, the Aegean, the Mediterranean and the Adriatic.

All these various cities were comprised in the name *Hellas*; all prided themselves on Hellenic blood, name, religion and mythical ancestry.²

The character of the Grecian territory, so like in many respects to that of Switzerland, produced two effects of great moment upon the history of the people. In the first place, it strengthened their powers of defence; for the pass of Thermopylae between Thessaly and Phocis, that of Kithaeron between Boeotia and Attica, or the mountainous range along the Isthmus of Corinth, were positions which an inferior number of brave men could hold against a much greater force of assailants. But in the next place, while it tended to protect each section of Greeks from being conquered, it also kept them politically disunited. It fostered that powerful principle of repulsion which led even the smallest township to constitute itself a political unit apart from the rest, and to resist all idea of

¹ We quote from George Grote's *History of Greece*. Someone has said "nobody knows Greek history, who has not mastered Grote." Its 25,000 sq. mi. (not counting islands) could be put into the lower third of Minnesota.

² The Greeks believed that they all were descended from the hero Hellen.

union with others. This incurable subdivision proved finally the cause of their ruin.³

THE GAMES

What are called the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games, were in reality great religious festivals; these great gatherings, frequented by crowds from every part of Greece, were of overwhelming importance and interest;⁴ yet they had once been purely local, attracting no visitors except from a very narrow neighborhood. As Greece gradually emerged from the turbulence and pugnacity of the heroic age, village festivals became town festivals, largely frequented by the citizens of other towns, and thus these once humble assemblages gradually swelled into the pomp of the Olympic and Pythian games.

Sometimes this tendency to religious fraternity took a form called an *Amphiktyony*, different from the common festival. A certain number of towns entered into an exclusive religious partnership, for the celebration of sacrifices periodically to the god of a particular temple, which was supposed to be the common property and under the common protection of all.

There was one amongst these many *Amphiktyonies*, which acquired so marked a predominance over the rest, as to be called *The Amphiktyonic assembly*, and even to have been mistaken by some authors for a sort of federal Hellenic Diet. Twelve sub-races, out of the number which made up entire Hellas, belonged to this ancient *Amphiktyony*, the meetings of which were held twice in every year: in spring at the temple of Apollo at Delphi; in autumn at Thermopylae, in the sacred precinct of Demeter *Amphiktyonis*.

The hero *Amphiktyon*, whose temple stood at Thermopylae,

³ Yet their common blood, common language, common games, common gods, beliefs and manners, it seems, might, and should have united them.

⁴ The Greeks counted time by Olympiads beginning at 776 B. C. the date of the first recorded Olympic game. An Olympiad was the four years between the holding of the Olympic games. Special topics: The town of Olympia in Elis where the games were held. Ancient Olympic feats. Modern Olympic feats, etc.

passed in mythical genealogy for the brother of the hero Hellen. And it may be affirmed, in truth, that the habit of forming Amphiktyonic unions, and of frequenting each other's religious festivals, was the great means of creating and fostering the primitive feeling of brotherhood among the children of Hellên, in those early times when rudeness, insecurity, and pugnacity did so much to isolate them.

The Pythian games, celebrated near Delphi, were under the superintendence of the Amphiktyons, or of some acting magistrate chosen to represent them. Like the Olympic games, they came round every four years; the Isthmian and Nemean games recurred every two years.

THE DELPHIC ORACLE

The foundation of the temple of Delphi itself reaches far beyond all historical knowledge, forming one of the aboriginal institutions of Hellas. It is a sanctified and wealthy place even in the *Iliad*: the legislation of Lycurgus at Sparta is introduced under its auspices, and the earliest Grecian colonies, those of Sicily and Italy in the eighth century B. C. are established by its mandate. Delphi and Dodona appear, in the most ancient times, as universally venerated oracles and sanctuaries: and Delphi not only receives honors and donations, but also answers questions from Lydians, Phrygians, Etruscans, Romans, etc.: it is not exclusively Hellenic. One of the valuable services which a Greek looked for from this and other great religious establishments was that it should resolve his doubts in cases of perplexity—that it should advise him whether to begin a new, or to persist in an old project—that it should foretell what would be his fate under given circumstances, and inform him, if suffering under distress, on what conditions the gods would grant him relief. The three priestesses of Dodona, with their venerable oak, and the priestess of Delphi sitting on her tripod under the influence of a certain gas or vapor exhaling from the rock, were alike believed to be competent to determine these difficult points and we shall have constant occa-

sion to notice with what complete faith both the question was put and the answer treasured up—what serious influence it often exercised both upon public and private proceeding. The hexameter verses in which the Pythian priestess delivered herself were indeed often so equivocal and unintelligible, that the most serious believer, with all anxiety to interpret and obey them, often found himself ruined by the result. Yet the general faith in the oracle was in no way shaken by such painful experience. For as the unfortunate issue always admitted of being explained upon two hypotheses—either that the god had spoken falsely, or that his meaning had not been correctly understood—no man of genuine piety ever hesitated to adopt the latter.

GODS OF THE GREEKS

To Homer and Hesiod, as well as to the Greeks universally, Zeus is the great and predominant god, “the father of gods and men” whose power none of the other gods can hope to resist, or even deliberately think of questioning. Zeus and his brothers Poseidon and Hades have made a division of power: he has reserved the aether and the atmosphere to himself—Poseidon has obtained the sea—and Hades the underworld or infernal regions; while earth, and the events which pass upon earth, are common to all of them, together with free access to Olympus.⁵

As the gods have houses and wives like men, so the gods must have a past to repose upon. First in order of time (we are told by Hesiod) came Chaos; next Gaea, the broad, firm, and flat Earth, with deep and dark Tartarus at her base. Eros (Love) the subduer of gods as well as men, came immediately afterwards. Gaea’s sons were the twelve Titans and Titanides, three Cyclopes, and three Hekatoncheires or beings with a hundred hands each.⁶

⁵ The mountain just beyond the northern boundary of ancient Greece. Its snow-capped summit, the most distant object the Greeks could see, was believed to be the home of the gods.

⁶ Special topics on the stories of the gods may be assigned; see Bulfinch, Hawthorne’s *Wonder-Book*, etc. Prometheus especially deserves attention.

Names of Gods, Goddesses, and Heroes

<i>Greek</i>	<i>Latin</i>	
Zeus	Jupiter	—god of the sky
Poseidôn	Neptune	—god of the sea
Arês	Mars	—god of war
Dionysus	Bacchus	—god of wine and revelry
Hermês	Mercury	—messenger god
Hêlios	Sol	—god of the sun
Hêphaestus	Vulcan	—god of the anvil
Hadês	Pluto	—god of the lower world
Hêrê	Juno	—wife of Jupiter
Athênê	Minerva	—goddess of wisdom
Artemis	Diana	—goddess of the moon
Aphroditê	Venus	—goddess of love
Eôs	Aurora	—goddess of dawn
Hestia	Vesta	—goddess of the hearth
Lêtô	Latona	—mother of Apollo and Artemis
Dêmêtêr	Ceres	—mother of harvest
Hêraklês	Hercules	—famed for strength
Asklêpius	Aesculapius	—famed for medical skill

CITY STATES

Sparta

The traveller who entered the Peloponnesus from Boeotia during the youthful days of Herodotus and Thucydides, found an array of powerful Doric cities, beginning at the Isthmus of Corinth. First came Megara, stretching across the isthmus from sea to sea, and occupying a high and rugged mountain ridge; next Corinth, with its strong and conspicuous acropolis. Proceeding southward along the western coast of the gulf of Argolis, and passing over the little river called Tanos, the traveller found himself in the dominion of Sparta, which comprised the entire southern region of the peninsula from its eastern to its western sea.

In the valley of the Eurotas, far removed from the sea, and accessible only through the most impracticable mountain roads lay the five unwallled, unadorned, adjoining villages, which bore collectively the formidable name of Sparta. The institutions of Sparta were peculiar to herself; distinguishing her not less from Argos, Corinth, Megara, etc., than from Athens or Thebes. Crete was the only other portion of Greece in which there prevailed institutions in many respects analogous, yet still dissimilar in

those two attributes which form the real mark of Spartan legislation, viz. the military discipline and the rigorous private training.⁷

Athens

There is no reason to doubt the general fact that Athens, like so many other communities of Greece, was in its primitive times governed by a hereditary line of kings, and that it passed from that form of government into a commonwealth, first oligarchical, afterwards democratical. But all the information which we possess is derived from authors who lived after all or most of these great changes.

The senate of Areopagus seems to represent the Homeric council of old men, and there were doubtless, on particular occasions, general assemblies of the people.

Of the nine archons, whose number continued unaltered from 683 B. C., to the end of the free democracy, three bore special titles—*The* Archon, the Archon Basileus (King), and the Polemarch. The archons both judged and administered, sharing among themselves those privileges which had once been united in the hands of the king, and probably accountable at the end of their year of office to the senate of Areopagus. All of these functionaries belonged to the Eupatrids (nobles).⁸

Solon

We now approach a new era in Grecian history—the first known example of a genuine and disinterested constitutional reform, and the first foundation-stone of that great fabric, which afterwards became the type of democracy in Greece. The archonship of the eupatrid Solon occurred in 594 B. C. thirty years after that of Drako. The lives of Solon by Plutarch and by Diogenes (especially the former) are our principal sources of information respecting this remarkable man, and while we thank them for

⁷ Special topics: Was there a Lycurgus? The gymnastic training of boys and girls; The public mess; The treatment of weak infants; The two Spartan kings; The classes of people—ephors, perioeki, helots; etc., etc.

⁸ Special topic: The work of the eupatrid Draco.

what they have told us, it is impossible to avoid expressing disappointment that they have not told us more. For Plutarch certainly had before him both the original poems, and the original laws of Solon, and the few transcripts, which he gives from one or the other form the principal charm of his biography.

It is in Solon's time that we obtain our first glimpse of the actual state of Attica and its inhabitants. There was a general mutiny of the poorer population against the rich, resulting from misery combined with oppression. The Thetes—the cultivating tenants, metayers, and small proprietors of the country—are now presented to us as forming the bulk of the population of Attica. They are exhibited as weighed down by debts and dependence, and driven in large numbers out of a state of freedom into slavery—the whole mass of them being in debt to the rich who were proprietors of the greater part of the soil. Every debtor unable to fulfil his contract was liable to be adjudged as the slave of his creditor, until he could find means either of paying it or working it out; and not only he himself, but his minor sons and unmarried daughters and sisters also, whom the law gave him the power of selling. Moreover a great number of the smaller properties in Attica were under mortgage, signified by a stone pillar erected on the land, inscribed with the name of the lender and the amount of the loan.

Solon's first measure of relief, the *Seisachtheia* or shaking off of burdens, cancelled at once all those contracts in which the debtor had borrowed on the security either of his person or of his land: it forbade all future loans or contracts in which the person of the debtor was pledged as security; it deprived the creditor in future of all power to imprison, or enslave, or extort work from his debtor, and confined him to an effective judgment at law authorizing the seizure of the property of the latter. It swept off all the numerous mortgage pillars from the landed properties in Attica, leaving the land free from all past claims. It liberated and restored to their full rights all debtors actually in slavery.

By this extensive measure the poor debtors, together with

their families, were rescued from suffering and peril. But these were not the only debtors in the state: the creditors and landlords doubtless were in their turn debtors to others, and were less able to discharge their obligations in consequence of the loss inflicted upon them by the *Seisachtheia*. It was to assist these wealthier debtors, whose bodies were in no danger, that Solon resorted to the additional expedient of debasing the money standard. He lowered the standard of the drachma in a proportion something more than 25 per cent, so that 100 drachmas of the new standard contained no more silver than 73 of the old, or 100 of the old were equivalent to 138 of the new. By this change the creditors of these more substantial debtors were obliged to submit to a loss, while the debtors acquired an exemption, to the extent of about 27 per cent.

One thing is never to be forgotten in regard to this measure, combined with the amendments introduced by Solon in the law—it settled finally the question to which it referred. Never again do we hear of the law of debtor and creditor as disturbing Athenian tranquillity. Solon had accomplished results surpassing his best hopes. He had healed the prevailing discontents; and such was the confidence and gratitude which he had inspired that he was now called upon to draw up a constitution and laws for the better working of the government in future. His constitutional changes were great and valuable....He distributed all the citizens into four classes according to the amount of their property.⁹

We now arrive at what may be called the second period of Grecian history, beginning with the rule of Peisistratus at Athens and of Croesus in Lydia. Peisistratus made himself despot of

⁹ Those whose annual income was equal to 500 medimni of corn (about 700 bu.) he placed in the highest class; those who received between 300 and 500 medimni formed the second class; and those between 200 and 300, the third. The fourth and most numerous class comprised all those who did not possess land yielding a produce equal to 200 medimni. The first class were alone eligible to the archonship and to all commands; the second were called the knights or horsemen of the state, as possessing enough to enable them to keep a horse and perform military service in that capacity; the third class formed the heavy-armed infantry, and were bound to serve, each with his full panoply. (Quoted from Grote.)

Athens in 560 B. C. He died in 527 B. C., and was succeeded by his son Hippias, who was deposed and expelled in 510 B. C., thus making an entire space of fifty years between the first exaltation of the father and the final expulsion of the son.¹⁰ Thucydides affirms that both he and his sons governed in a wise and virtuous spirit, levying from the people only an income-tax of five per cent. This is high praise coming from such an authority, though it seems that we ought to make some allowance for the circumstance of Thucydides being connected by descent with the Peisistratid family.

Kleisthenes

After the expulsion of Hippias there appeared again what Attica had not known for thirty years, declared political parties, and pronounced opposition between two men as leaders—on one side, Isagoras, a person of illustrious descent—on the other, Kleisthenes, the Alkmaeonid, not less illustrious, and possessing at this moment a claim on the gratitude of his countrymen as the most persevering as well as the most effective foe of the dethroned despots. In what manner such opposition was carried on we are not told; but at any rate, Kleisthenes had the worst of it, and in consequence of this defeat (says the historian), “he took into partnership the people, who had been before excluded from everything.” His partnership with the people gave birth to the Athenian democracy: it was a real and important revolution.

Kleisthenes preserved, but at the same time modified and expanded, all the main features of Solon’s political constitution; the public assembly or Ekklesia—the preconsidering senate composed of members from all the tribes—and the habit of annual election, as well as annual responsibility of magistrates, by and to the Ekklesia. But the Kleisthenean Ekklesia acquired new strength, and almost a new character, from the great increase of the number of citizens qualified to attend it; while the annually-changed senate, instead of being composed of four hundred mem-

¹⁰ Special topics: The deceits used by Peisistratus; His useful deeds; Athens under his rule.

bers taken in equal proportion from each of the four old tribes, was enlarged to five hundred, taken equally from each of the new ten tribes. It now comes before us, under the name of Senate of Five Hundred, as an active and indispensable body throughout the whole Athenian democracy. Both the senate thus constituted, and the public assembly, were far more popular and vigorous than they had been under the original arrangement of Solon.

One other remarkable institution, distinctly ascribed to Kleisthenes¹¹ yet remains to be noticed—the ostracism. By the ostracism a citizen was banished without special accusation, trial or defence, for a term of ten years—later diminished to five. His property was not taken away, nor his reputation tainted; so that the penalty consisted solely in the banishment from his native city to some other Greek city. The process of ostracism was carried into effect by writing upon a shell or potsherd (*ostrakon* in Greek) the name of the person whom a citizen thought it prudent for a time to banish; which shell, when deposited in the proper vessel counted for a vote towards the sentence.¹²

WAR WITH PERSIA

There existed at the commencement of historical Greece in 776 B. C., besides the Ionians in Attica and the Cyclades, twelve Ionian cities of note on or near the coast of Asia Minor, besides a few others less important. These cities were conquered by the

¹¹ Scholars think that very possibly ostracism originated before the time of Kleisthenes.

¹² Before the vote of ostracism could be taken, a case was to be made out in the senate and the public assembly to justify it. These two bodies debated and determined whether the state of the republic was menacing enough to call for such an exceptional measure. If they decided in the affirmative, a day was named, the agora was railed round, with ten entrances left for the citizens of each tribe, and ten separate casks or vessels for depositing the votes, which consisted of a shell or a potsherd with the name of the person written on it whom each citizen designed to banish. At the end of the day the number of votes were summed up, and if 6000 votes were found to have been given against any one person, that person was ostracised; if not, the ceremony ended in nothing. Ten days were allowed to him for settling his affairs, after which he was required to depart from Attica for ten years, but retained his property, and suffered no other penalty. (Quoted from Grote.)

Lydian king Croesus, who ascended the throne in 560 B. C. and appeared to be at the summit of human prosperity and power in his unassailable capital, and with his countless treasures at Sardis. His dominions comprised nearly the whole of Asia Minor, as far as the river Halys to the east; on the other side of that river began the Median monarchy.

Yet within the space of thirty years or a little more, Asia Minor, Egypt, Chaldea, and Media, had become embodied in one vast empire, under Darius, King of Persia.

Miletus was now in the height of power and prosperity—in every respect the leading city of Ionia.

[We cannot take space to tell how the ruler of Miletus revolted against Persia, and how Sardis was burned.].

The Athenians at once resolved to send a fleet of twenty ships as an aid to the revolted Ionians.¹³

Darius had been thrown into violent indignation by the attack and burning of Sardis, and by the general revolt of Ionia headed by Miletus, but carried into effect by the active co-operation of the Athenians. "The Athenians (exclaimed Darius)—who are *they?*?" On receiving the answer, he asked for his bow, placed an arrow on the string, and shot as high as he could towards the heavens, saying—"Grant me, Zeus, to revenge myself on the Athenians." He at the same time desired an attendant to remind him thrice every day at dinner—"Master, remember the Athenians."

Darius's first expedition against Athens

The intentions of Darius for the conquest of Greece were now effectively manifested. Mardonius¹⁴ with supreme command, and at the head of a large force, was sent down in the ensuing spring for the purpose. Having reached Cilicia in the course of the march, he himself got on shipboard and went by sea to Ionia, while his army marched across Asia Minor to the Hellespont.

¹³ This was very much like a slap in the face of Persia. Compare on the map the size of Athens and that of the whole Persian empire in about 500 B. C.

¹⁴ son-in-law of Darius

Mardonius did not remain long in Ionia, but passed on with his fleet to the Hellespont, where the land-force had already arrived. He transported it across into Europe, and began his march through Thrace. . . . The island of Thasus surrendered to the fleet without resistance, and the land-force was conveyed across the Strymon to the Greek city of Akanthus, on the western coast of the Strymonic Gulf. From hence Mardonius marched into Macedonia, and subdued a considerable portion of its inhabitants. Meanwhile he sent his fleet to double the promontory of Mount Athos, and to join the land-force again at the Gulf of Therma, with a view of conquering as much of Greece as he could, and even of prosecuting the march as far as Athens and Eretria. The sea near Athos was then, and is now, full of peril to navigators. One of the hurricanes so frequent in its neighborhood overtook the Persian fleet, destroyed three hundred ships, and drowned or cast ashore not less than twenty thousand men. Of those who reached the shore, many died of cold, or were devoured by the wild beasts on that inhospitable tongue of land. This disaster checked altogether the further progress of Mardonius. Both the land-force and the fleet were conveyed back to the Hellespont, and from thence across to Asia, with so much shame of failure, that Mardonius was never again employed by Darius; though we cannot make out that the fault was imputable to him. We shall hear of him again under Xerxes.

Darius's second expedition against Greece

Though dissatisfied with Mardonius, Darius was only the more eagerly bent on his project of conquering Greece. Orders were despatched to the maritime cities of his empire to equip both ships of war and horse-transporters for a renewed attempt. His intentions were probably known in Greece itself by this time, from the recent march of his army to Macedonia. Nevertheless he now thought it advisable to send heralds round to most of the Grecian cities, in order to require from each the formal token of submission—earth and water; and thus to ascertain what extent of resistance

his projected expedition was likely to experience. The answers were to a high degree favorable. Many of the continental Greeks sent their submission as well as all those islanders to whom application was made.

Among these heralds, some had gone both to Athens and to Sparta, for the same purpose of demanding earth and water. The reception given to them at both places was angry in the extreme. The Athenians cast the herald into the pit called the Barathrum, into which they sometimes precipitated public criminals; the Spartans threw the herald, who came to them, into a well, desiring the unfortunate messenger to take earth and water from thence to the king.

Meanwhile a vast Persian force, brought together in consequence of the preparation made during the last two years in every part of the empire, had assembled in the Aleian plain of Cilicia near the sea. A fleet of six hundred armed triremes, together with many transports both for men and horses, was brought hither for their embarkation: the troops were put on board and sailed along the coast to Samos in Ionia. Their instructions were to reduce to subjection and tribute all such Greeks as had not already given earth and water. But Darius directed them particularly to conquer Eretria and Athens, and to bring the inhabitants as slaves into his presence.

The recent terrific storm near Mount Athos deterred the Persians from following the example of Mardonius, and it was resolved to strike straight across the Aegean from Samos to Euboea, attacking the intermediate islands in the way. Pursuing his course without resistance along the islands and demanding reinforcements as well as hostages from each, Datis¹⁵, at length touched the southernmost portion of Euboea—the town of Karystus and its territory. The temples of Eretria were burnt, and its inhabitants dragged into slavery. Datis had thus accomplished with little or no resistance one of the two express objects commanded by Darius;

¹⁵ the general in command

and his army were elated with the confident hope of soon completing the other.

The battle of Marathon 490 B. C.

After halting a few days at Eretria, Datis re-embarked his army to cross over to Attica, and landed in the memorable bay of Marathon on the eastern coast.

Of the feeling which now prevailed at Athens we have no details. But doubtless the alarm was hardly inferior to that which had been felt at Eretria. Pheidippides the courier¹⁶ was sent to Sparta immediately to solicit assistance; and such was his prodigious activity, that he performed this journey of 150 miles, on foot, in forty-eight hours.

The Spartan authorities readily promised their aid, but unfortunately it was now the ninth day of the moon. Ancient law or custom forbade them to march, in this month at least, during the last quarter before the full moon; but after the full they engaged to march without delay. Five days' delay at this critical moment might prove the utter ruin of Athens; yet the reason assigned seems to have been no pretence on the part of the Spartans.

Of the two opposing armies at Marathon, we are told that the Athenians were 10,000 hoplites, either including or besides the 1000 who came from Plataea.¹⁷

The numbers of the Persians we cannot be said to know at all, nor is there anything certain except that they were greatly superior to the Greeks.

¹⁶ See Robert Browning's poem "Pheidippides."

¹⁷ While the Athenian army were mustered on the ground sacred to Herakles near Marathon, they were joined by the whole force of the little town of Plataea, consisting of about 1000 hoplites. Their coming on this important occasion seems to have been a spontaneous effort of gratitude. If we summon up to our imaginations all the circumstances of the case—which it requires some effort to do, because our authorities come from subsequent generations, after Greece had ceased to fear the Persians—we shall be sensible that this volunteer march of the whole Plataean force to Marathon is one of the most affecting incidents of all Grecian history. Upon Athens generally it produced an indelible impression, commemorated ever afterwards in the public prayers of the Athenian herald, and repaid by a grant to the Plataeans of the full civil rights of Athenian citizens. Upon the Athenians then marshalled at Marathon its effect must have been unspeakably powerful and encouraging. (Quoted from Grote.)

Marathon, situated near to a bay on the eastern coast of Attica, and in a direction E. N. E. from Athens, is divided by the high ridge of Mount Pentelikus from the city, with which it communicated by two roads, one to the north, another to the south of that mountain. Of these two roads, the northern, at once the shortest and the most difficult, is twenty-two miles in length: the southern—longer but more easy, and the only one practicable for chariots—is twenty-six miles in length, or about six and a half hours of computed march. It passed between Mounts Pentelikus and Hymettus. The bay of Marathon, sheltered by a projecting cape from the northward, affords both deep water and a shore convenient for landing; while “its plain (says a careful modern observer) extends in a perfect level along this fine bay and is in length about six miles, in breadth never less than about one mile and a half.”

The position occupied by Miltiades¹⁸ before the battle, identified as it was to all subsequent Athenians by the sacred grove of Herakles near Marathon, was probably on some portion of the high ground above this plain. The Persians occupied a position on the plain; their fleet was ranged along the beach.

At length the sacrifices in the Greek camp were favorable for battle. Miltiades, who had everything to gain by coming immediately to close quarters, ordered his army to advance at a running step over the interval of one mile which separated the two armies. This rapid forward movement, accompanied by the war-cry or paeon which always animated the charge of the Greek soldier, astounded the Persian army. They construed it as an act of desperate courage little short of insanity, in a body not only small but destitute of cavalry or archers—but they at the same time felt their conscious superiority sink within them. It seems to have been long remembered also among the Greeks as the peculiar characteristic of the battle of Marathon, and Herodotus tells us that the Athenians were the first Greeks who ever charged at a run.

The Persians, after a certain resistance, were overborne and

¹⁸ in command of the Greek force

driven back. The pursuit became general, and the Persians were chased to their ships ranged in line along the shore. Some of them became involved in the impassable marsh and there perished. The Athenians tried to set the ships on fire, but the defence here was both vigorous and successful—several of the forward warriors of Athens were slain and only seven ships out of the numerous fleet destroyed.

The number of Athenian dead is accurately known, since all were collected for the last solemn obsequies—they were 192.¹⁹ How many were wounded we do not hear. The brother of the poet Aeschylus,—himself present at the fight²⁰—in laying hold on the poop-staff of one of the vessels, had his hand cut off by an axe, and died of the wound.

But the Persians, though thus defeated and compelled to abandon the position of Marathon, were not yet disposed to relinquish altogether their chances against Attica. Their fleet was observed to take the direction of Cape Sunium. At the same time a shield, discernible from its polished surface afar off, was seen held aloft upon some high point of Attica—perhaps on the summit of Mount Pentelikus. The Athenians doubtless saw it as well as the Persians; and Miltiades realized that it was a signal put up by partisans in the country, to invite the Persians round to Athens by sea, while the Marathonian army was absent.

Miltiades saw through the plot, and lost not a moment in returning to Athens. On the very day of the battle, the Athenian army marched back with the utmost speed to Athens, which they reached before the arrival of the Persian fleet. A little less quickness on the part of Miltiades in deciphering the treasonable signal, and giving the instant order of march—a little less energy on the part of the Athenian citizens in superadding a fatiguing march to a no less fatiguing combat—and the Persians might have been found in possession of Athens. As the facts turned out, Datis finding at Phalerum the unexpected presence of the soldiers who

¹⁹ Special topic: The opening of the burial mound in 1890–1891.

²⁰ Compare Aeschylus's drama "The Persians."

had already vanquished him at Marathon, made no attempt again to disembark in Attica, but sailed away.

Thus was Athens rescued, for this time at least, from a danger not less terrible than imminent. Upon the Athenians themselves, the first to face in the field successfully the terrific look of a Persian army, the effect of the victory was stirring and profound. It was the exploit of Athenians alone, but of all Athenians, without dissent or exception; the people seem never to have become weary of allusions to their single-handed victory over a host of forty-six nations.

The wrath of Darius against the Athenians rose to a higher pitch than ever, and he commenced vigorous preparations for a renewed attack upon them as well as upon Greece generally. Resolved upon assembling the entire force of his empire, he directed the various satraps and sub-governors throughout all Asia to provide troops, horses, and ships both of war and burden. For no less than three years the empire was agitated by this immense levy, which Darius determined to conduct in person against Greece. He was on the point of undertaking simultaneously two enterprises—the conquest of Greece and the reconquest of Egypt—when he was surprised by death, after a reign of thirty-six years. As a precaution previous to this intended march, he had nominated as successor Xerxes, his son by Atossa.

Xerxes' expedition against Greece

On succeeding to the throne, Xerxes found the forces of the empire in active preparation, pursuant to the orders of Darius. In the autumn of the year 481 B. C., the vast army arrived from all quarters of the empire, at or near to Sardis. But this land force, vast as it was, was not all that the empire had been required to furnish. A fleet of 1207 ships of war had been assembled on the Hellespont, and on the coasts of Thrace and Ionia.

If the whole contemporary world were overawed by the vast assemblage of men and muniments of war, which Xerxes thus brought together, so much transcending all past, we might even say all subsequent experience—they were no less astounded by

two enterprises which entered into his scheme—the bridging of the Hellespont, and the cutting of a ship-canal through the isthmus of Mount Athos.

The bridge of boats—or rather the two separate bridges not far removed from each other—Xerxes caused to be thrown across the Hellespont where the strait is about an English mile in breadth. The work had been completed and announced to Xerxes as available for transit, when a storm arose so violent as altogether to ruin it. The wrath of the monarch, when apprised of this catastrophe, burst all bounds. It was directed partly against the chief engineers, whose heads he caused to be struck off, but partly also against the Hellespont itself. He commanded that the strait should be scourged with 300 lashes, and that a set of fetters should be let down into it as a further punishment. Moreover Herodotus had heard, but does not believe, that he even sent irons for the purpose of branding it.

The expedition of Xerxes took place when Herodotus was about four years old, so that he afterwards enjoyed ample opportunity of conversing with persons who had witnessed and taken part in it: and the whole of his narrative shows that he availed himself largely of such access to information.

New engineers were immediately directed to recommence the work, which Herodotus now describes in detail, and which was executed with increased care and solidity. Over each of the two lines of ships, across from shore to shore, were stretched six vast cables,²¹ which discharged the double function of holding the ships together, and of supporting the bridge-way to be laid upon them. Over these again were laid planks of wood secured above by a second line of cables stretched across to keep them in their places. Lastly, upon this foundation the causeway itself was formed, out of earth and wood, with a palisade on each side high enough to prevent the cattle that passed over from seeing the water.

While wintering at Sardis, the Persian monarch had despatched heralds to all the cities of Greece, except Sparta and Athens,

²¹ Two were of flax and four of papyrus. (Grote.)

to demand the tokens of submission, earth and water. The news of his prodigious armament was well calculated to spread terror even among the most resolute of them. He at the same time had sent orders to the maritime cities in Thrace and Macedonia to prepare "dinner" for himself and his vast suite as he passed on his march.

From Sardis, the host of Xerxes²² directed its march to Abydos. So vast were the numbers of his army according to Herodotus that they occupied no less than seven days and seven nights, without a moment's intermission, in the business of crossing the Hellespont.

At the important station called Ennea Hodoi or Nine-Roads, afterwards memorable by the foundation of Amphipolis, bridges had already been thrown over the river,²³ to which the Magian priests rendered solemn honors by sacrificing white horses and throwing them into the stream. Moreover the religious feelings of Xerxes were not satisfied without the more precious sacrifices often resorted to by the Persians. He here buried alive nine native youths and nine maidens, in compliment to Nine-roads.

Xerxes had now arrived within sight of Mount Olympus, the northern boundary of what was properly called Hellas.

Events at Athens

Our information respecting the affairs of Greece immediately after the repulse of the Persians from Marathon is very scanty. Aristides and Themistocles became the chief men at Athens; but the rivalry between the two became so bitter and menacing, that after three or four years of continued political rivalry, the two chiefs appealed to a vote of ostracism,²⁴ and Aristides was banished. The Persian armament had been driven with disgrace from Attica back to Asia; but the Persian monarch had an increased thirst for revenge; and Themistocles knew well that the danger

²² Special topics: Herodotus's account of the army; Xerxes' cruelty at Sardis to an aged father; Xerxes at Ilium.

²³ the Strymon.

²⁴ See page 85.

from that quarter would recur greater than ever. He believed that it would recur again in the same way by an expedition across the Aegean like that of Datis to Marathon; against which the best defence would be found in a numerous and well-trained fleet. Themistocles now prevailed upon his countrymen to begin with energy the work of maritime preparation. Not only were two hundred new ships built, and citizens trained as seamen—but the important work was commenced, during the year when Themistocles was either archon or general, of forming and fortifying a new harbor for Athens at Peiraeus, instead of the ancient open bay of Phalerum. Peiraeus with its three separate natural ports, admitting of being closed and fortified, was incomparably superior in safety as well as convenience.

The formal announcements of Xerxes all designated Athens as the special object of his wrath and vengeance. Neither to Athens, nor to Sparta, were any heralds sent; and these two cities were thus from the beginning identified in interest and in the necessity of defence. Both Athens and Sparta sent in this trying moment to consult the Delphian oracle;²⁵ while both at the same time joined to convene a Pan-Hellenic congress at the Isthmus of Corinth, for the purpose of organizing resistance against the expected invader. This congress sought to combine every city of Hellenic race and language, however distant, which could be induced to take part in it. It seemed at first to promise an onward march toward Greek union, but the promise will not be found realised.

As soon as the congress met, it became essential to recognise some one commanding city. With regard to the land-force, no one dreamed of contesting the pre-eminence of Sparta. But in respect to the fleet, as Sparta furnished at most only sixteen ships, and little or no nautical skill, while Athens brought two-thirds of the entire naval force, with the best ships and seamen, the idea was at first started that Athens should command at sea and Sparta

²⁵ Special topic: The answer of the Delphic oracle.

on land; but the majority of the allies manifested a decided repugnance, announcing that they would follow no one but a Spartan. To the honour of the Athenians, they at once waived their pretensions.

During the winter preceding the march of Xerxes from Sardis, the congress at the Isthmus was trying, with little success, to bring the Grecian cities into united action.

It was about the time when Xerxes was about to pass the Hellespont, in the beginning of 480 B. C., that the first actual step for resistance was taken, at the instigation of the Thessalians. They now sent envoys to the Isthmus, intimating the necessity of guarding the passes of Olympus, the northernmost entrance of Greece. Accordingly a body of 10,000 Grecian heavy-armed infantry, under the command of the Spartan Euænetus and the Athenian Themistocles, was sent to occupy the defile of Tempê, through which the river Peneius makes its way to the sea, by a cleft between the mountains Olympus and Ossa.

The long, narrow, and winding defile of Tempê formed then, and forms still, the single entrance, open throughout winter as well as summer from lower or maritime Macedonia into Thessaly. The lofty mountain precipices approach so closely as to leave hardly room enough in some places for a road: it is thus eminently defensible, and a few resolute men would be sufficient to arrest in it the progress of the most numerous host. But the Greeks soon discovered that the position was such as they could not hold,—first, because the powerful fleet of Xerxes would be able to land troops in their rear; secondly, because there was also a second-entrance passable in summer, from upper Macedonia into Thessaly, by the mountain passes over the range of the Olympus. So great was the alarm produced by the unexpected discovery, that the Greeks remained only a few days at Tempê, then at once retired back to their ships, and returned by sea to the Isthmus of Corinth—about the time when Xerxes was crossing the Hellespont.

Thermopylae

The pass of Thermopylae²⁶ was now fixed upon as the most convenient point of defence, next to that of Tempê. At Thermopylae, the overhanging projection of Mount Ceta was steep, woody, and impracticable, leaving access, from Thessaly into Locris only through the straight gate. The wall originally built across the pass by the Phocians was now half-ruined by age and neglect; but the Greeks easily re established it, determining to await in this narrow pass the approach of the invading host. The edge of the sea-line appears to have been for the most part marsh, fit neither for walking nor for sailing; but there were points at which boats could land, so that constant communication could be maintained with the fleet at Artemisium.

The Greek troops and fleet did not actually occupy these positions until Xerxes was known to have reached the Thermaic Gulf. Both were then put in motion; the land-force under the Spartan king Leonidas, the naval force under the Spartan commander Eurybiades, apparently about the latter part of the month of June (480 B. C.). Leonidas conducted from the Isthmus to Thermopylae a select band of 300 Spartans, with perhaps four or five thousand more from other states. The question naturally suggests itself, why the Greeks did not at once send their full force instead of a mere advanced guard? The answer is to be found in the fact that it was the time of celebrating both the Olympic festival in Elis and the Karneian festival in Sparta and in most of the other Dorian states. Even at a moment when their whole

²⁶ Immediately near to Anthela, the northern slope of the mighty and prolonged ridge of Oeta approached so close to the gulf, or at least to an inaccessible morass which formed the edge of the gulf, as to leave no more than one single wheel track between. This narrow entrance formed the western gate of Thermopylae. At some little distance, seemingly about a mile, to the eastward, the same close conjunction between the mountain and the sea was repeated—thus forming the eastern gate of Thermopylae. The space between these two gates was wider and more open, but it was distinguished by its abundant flow of thermal springs, salt and sulphureous. Such was the general scene—two narrow openings with an intermediate mile of enlarged road and hot springs between them—which passed in ancient times by the significant name of Thermopylae, the Hot Gates; or sometimes more briefly, Pylae—The Gates. (Quoted from Grote.)

freedom and existence were at stake, the Greeks could not bring themselves to postpone these venerated solemnities.

Meanwhile Xerxes, encamped within sight of Thermopylae, suffered four days to pass without making any attack. A probable reason may be found in the extreme peril of his fleet, reported to have been utterly destroyed by the storm.²⁷ On the fifth day he became wroth at the impudence and recklessness of the petty garrison before him, and sent against them the Median and Kisian divisions, with orders to seize them and bring them as prisoners into his presence. The Medes manifested great personal bravery; a close combat hand to hand was indispensable, and in this the Greeks had every advantage of organization as well as armor. Short spears, light wicker shields, and tunics, in the assailants, were an imperfect match for the long spears, heavy and spreading shields, steady ranks and practised fighting of the defenders. Yet the bravest men of the Persian army pressed on from behind, and having nothing but numbers in their favour, maintained long this unequal combat, with great slaughter to themselves, and little loss to the Greeks.

At the end of two days' fighting no impression had been made. The pass appeared impracticable, and even the defense not less triumphant than courageous—when a Malian named Ephialtes revealed to Xerxes the existence of an unfrequented mountain-path. This at least was the man singled out by the general voice of Greece as the betrayer of the fatal secret.

Had the full numerical strength of the Greeks been at Thermopylae, instead of staying behind for the festivals, they might have planted such a force on the mountain path as would have rendered it not less impregnable than the pass beneath.

The Persian commander Hydarnes arrived in the rear of Thermopylae not long after mid-day. But before he had yet completed his descent, the fatal truth had already been made

²⁷ A storm had destroyed a large number of the ships of both Persians and Greeks and thus prevented the naval encounters near Artemisium from being decisive.

known to Leonidas, that the enemy were closing in upon him behind. But to Leonidas the idea of retreat was intolerable. His own personal honour, together with that of his Spartan companions and of Sparta herself, forbade him to think of yielding to the enemy the pass which he had been sent to defend. The laws of his country required him to conquer or die in the post assigned to him, whatever might be the superiority of number on the part of the enemy; moreover we are told that the Delphian oracle had declared that either Sparta itself or a king of Sparta, must fall victim to the Persian arms. Had he retired he could hardly have escaped that voice of reproach which, in Greece especially, always burst upon the general who failed; while his voluntary devotion and death would not only silence every whisper of calumny, but exalt him to the pinnacle of glory both as a man and as a king, and set an example of chivalrous patriotism at the moment when the Greek world most needed the lesson.

The devoted band thus left with Leonidas at Thermopylae consisted of 300 Spartans, with a certain number of helots attending them together with 700 Thespians. They fought with reckless bravery and desperation, until at length their spears were broken, and they had no weapon left except swords. It was at this juncture that Leonidas himself was slain, and around his body the battle became fiercer than ever; the Persians exhausted all their efforts to possess themselves of it, but were repulsed by the Greeks four several times, with the loss of many of their chiefs, especially two brothers of Xerxes. Fatigued, exhausted, diminished in number, and deprived of their most effective weapons, the little band of defenders retired, with the body of their chief, into the narrow strait behind the cross wall, where they sat altogether on a hillock, exposed to the attack of the main Persian army on one side, and of the detachment of Hydarnes, which had now completed its march, on the other. They were thus surrounded, overwhelmed with missiles, and slain to a man; not losing courage even to the last, but defending themselves with their remaining daggers.

Thus perished Leonidas with his heroic comrades. The epi-

gram composed shortly afterwards and inscribed on the spot by order of the Amphiktyonic assembly, transmitted to posterity the formal boast that 4000 warriors "from Peloponnesus had here fought with 300 myriads or 3,000,000 of enemies." While this inscription was intended as a general commemoration of the exploit, there was another near it, alike simple and impressive, destined for the Spartan dead separately: "Stranger, tell the Lacedemonians that we lie here, in obedience to their orders."

The Battle of the Bay of Salamis 480 B. C.

The admiration the Greeks felt for the courage and patriotism of Leonidas and his band was overpowered, however, by the more pressing emotions of disappointment and terror. So confident were the Spartans and Peloponnesians in the defensibility of Thermopylae and Artemisium, that when the news of the disaster reached them, not a single soldier had yet been put in motion; the season of the festival-games had passed, but no active step had yet been taken. Meanwhile the invading force, army and fleet, was in progress towards Attica and Peloponnesus, without the least preparations—and what was still worse, without any combined and concerted plan—for defending the heart of Greece.

To defend the Isthmus of Corinth was all that the Peloponnesians now thought of, and seemingly all that was now open to them. Thither they rushed with all their available population under the conduct of Kleombrotus, king of Sparta (brother of Leonidas), and began to draw fortifications across it.

If the causes of alarm were great for the Peloponnesians, yet more desperate did the position of the Athenians appear. Expecting, according to agreement, that there would be a Peloponnesian army to sustain Leonidas, or at any rate to co-operate in the defence of Attica, they had taken no measures to remove their families or property. But they saw with indignant disappointment as well as dismay that the conqueror was in full march from Thermopylae, that the road to Attica was open to him, and that the

Peloponnesians were absorbed exclusively in the defence of their own isthmus and their own separate existence.

Meanwhile Themistocles and the Athenian seamen landed at Phalerum, and made their mournful entry into Athens. Gloomy as the prospect appeared, there was little room for difference of opinion, and still less room for delay. The authorities and the public assembly at once issued a proclamation, enjoining every Athenian to remove his family out of the country in the best way he could. We may conceive the state of tumult and terror which followed on this unexpected proclamation, when we reflect that it had to be circulated and acted upon throughout all Attica within the narrow space of less than six days. The whole Grecian fleet was doubtless employed in carrying out the helpless exiles; mostly to Troezen, but in part also to Ægina and to Salamis. Themistocles impressed upon the sufferers that they were only obeying the oracle, which had directed them to abandon the city and to take refuge behind the wooden walls.

Of the combined Greek fleet of 366 ships, now at Salamis, no less than 200 were Athenian.

Hardly was the fleet mustered at Salamis, and the Athenian population removed, when Xerxes and his host overran the deserted country, his fleet occupying Phalerum and the coast adjoining.

But while on the shore of Phalerum an omnipotent will compelled seemingly unanimity and precluded all real deliberation, great indeed was the contrast presented by the neighboring Greek armament at Salamis, among the members of which unmeasured dissension had been reigning. Eurybiades, the commander of the Greek fleet had called the chiefs together to consider what position was the fittest for a naval engagement. Most of them, especially those from Peloponnesus, were averse to remaining at Salamis, and proposed that the fleet should be transferred to the Isthmus of Corinth, where it would be in immediate communication with the Peloponnesian land-force. In the midst of the debate, a messenger arrived with news of the capture and conflagration of Athens and

her acropolis by the Persians. Such was the terror produced by this intelligence, that some of the chiefs, without even awaiting the conclusion of the debate and the final vote, quitted the council forthwith, and began to hoist sail, or prepare their rowers, for departure.

Themistocles, now, contriving a pretext for stealing away from the meeting, despatched a messenger across the strait with a secret communication to the Persian generals, to acquaint them privately in the name of Themistocles, who was represented as wishing success at heart to the Persians, that the Greek fleet was not only in the utmost alarm, meditating immediate flight, but that the various portions of it were in such violent dissension, that they were more likely to fight against each other than against any common enemy. A splendid opportunity (it was added) was thus opened to the Persians, if they chose to avail themselves of it without delay, first to enclose and prevent their flight, and then to attack a disunited body, many of whom would, when the combat began, openly espouse the Persian cause.

When this message was delivered to Xerxes, he entered so greedily into the scheme as to direct his generals to close up the strait on both sides during the night, to the north as well as to the south of the town of Salamis, at the risk of their heads if any opening were left for the Greeks to escape.

Meanwhile the angry controversy among the Grecian chiefs continued without abatement and without decision. Nor was it until the arrival of a vessel, deserting from the Persian fleet, that they at last brought themselves to credit the actual condition of affairs and the entire impossibility of retreat. Once satisfied of this fact, they prepared themselves for the impending battle at dawn.

Having caused his land-force to be drawn up along the shore opposite to Salamis, Xerxes had erected for himself a lofty seat or throne, upon one of the projecting declivities of Mount Ægaleos, immediately overhanging the sea, from whence he could plainly review all phases of the combat and the conduct of his subject troops.

The Greeks rowed forward from the shore to attack, with the usual paean or war-shout, which was confidently returned by the Persians. Indeed the latter were the most forward of the two to begin the fight; the subjects of Xerxes conducted themselves generally with great bravery. Their signal defeat was not owing to any want of courage—but, first, to the narrow space which rendered their superior number a hindrance rather than a benefit: next, to their want of orderly line and discipline as compared with the Greeks: thirdly, to the fact that when once fortune seemed to turn against them, each ally was willing to sacrifice or even run down others, in order to effect his own escape. Their numbers and absence of concert threw them into confusion and caused them to run foul of each other. Those in front could not recede, nor could those in the rear advance: the oar-blades were broken by collision, the steersmen lost control of their ships, and could no longer adjust the ship's course so as to strike that direct blow with the beak which was essential in ancient warfare. After some time of combat, the whole Persian fleet was driven back and became thoroughly unmanageable.

Great and capital as the victory was, there yet remained after it a sufficient portion of the Persian fleet to maintain even maritime war vigorously, not to mention the powerful land-force, as yet unshaken. And the Greeks themselves—immediately after they had collected in their island, as well as could be done, the fragments of shipping and the dead bodies—made ready for a second engagement. But they were relieved from this necessity by the pusillanimity of the invading monarch, in whom the defeat had occasioned a sudden revulsion from contemptuous confidence not only to rage and disappointment, but to the extreme of alarm for his own personal safety. He was possessed with a feeling of mingled wrath and distrust against his naval force, which consisted entirely of subject nations. He fancied that they could make no resistance to the Greek fleet, and dreaded lest the latter should sail forthwith to the Hellespont, so as to break down the bridge and intercept his personal retreat; for upon the maintenance of that bridge he

conceived his own safety to turn. He speedily ended by giving orders to the whole fleet to leave Phalerum in the night. They were directed to make straight for the Hellespont, and there to guard the bridge against his arrival.

This resolution was prompted by Mardonius, who saw the real terror which beset his master, and read therein sufficient evidence of danger to himself. He knew full well that there was no safety for him in returning to Persia with the shame of failure on his head. It was better for him to take upon himself the chance of subduing Greece, which he had good hopes of being yet able to do, and to advise the return of Xerxes himself to a safe and easy residence in Asia. Such counsel was eminently palatable to the present alarm of the monarch, while it opened to Mardonius himself a fresh chance not only of safety, but of increased power and glory. Accordingly he began to urge that Xerxes might now very well retire with the bulk of his army, and that he, Mardonius, would pledge himself to complete the conquest, at the head of 300,000 chosen troops. But as it was now the beginning of September, and as 60,000 out of his forces were destined to escort Xerxes to the Hellespont, Mardonius proposed to winter in Thessaly, and to postpone further military operations until the ensuing spring.

[We omit the story of how Alexander of Macedonia was sent by the Persian^s to Athens to offer the Athenians a special alliance with Persia; how Athens scornfully refused; how the Peloponnesians continued to fortify the Isthmus; how in May or June the Athenians were forced to leave their city the second time—this time to Mardonius who made it his headquarters; how finally Sparta sent an army to the aid of Athens; and how at Plataea, the following spring, (479 B. C.) the forces of Mardonius were at last defeated by a Greek force made up of Athenians, Lacedemonians, Boeotians, Corinthians and others. All these points may be taken up in special topics.]

Athens after the war with Persia

Athens was in the eye and feeling of Greece no longer the same power as before the war with Persia. She had suffered more, and at sea had certainly done more, than all the other allies put together.

From the beginning to the end of the struggle, Athens had displayed an unreserved Pan-Hellenic patriotism which had been most ungenerously requited by the Peloponnesians; who had kept within their Isthmian walls, and had betrayed Attica twice to hostile ravage; the first time, perhaps, unavoidably—but the second time by a culpable neglect in postponing their outward march against Mardonius.

Considering that the Peloponnesians had sustained little or no mischief by the invasion, we might naturally expect to find them, if not lending their grateful and active aid to repair the damage in Attica, at least cordially welcoming the restoration of the ruined city by its former inhabitants. Instead of this, we find the same selfishness again prevalent among them. Ill-will and mistrust for the future overlays all their gratitude and sympathy.

The Athenians, on returning from Salamis after the battle of Plataea, found a desolate home to harbour them. Their country was laid waste,—their city burnt or destroyed, so that there remained but a few houses standing, wherein the Persian officers had taken up their quarters—and their fortifications for the most part razed or overthrown. It was their first task to bring home their families and effects from the temporary places of shelter. Next they began to rebuild their city and its fortifications on a scale of enlarged size in every direction.²⁸ But as soon as they were seen to be employed on this indispensable work, the allies took the alarm, preferred complaints to Sparta, and urged her to arrest the work. In the front of these complainants probably stood the Æginetans, as the old enemies of Athens, and as having most to apprehend from her might at sea.

Themistocles, the moment that the walls of the city had been finished, prevailed upon the Athenians to provide harbor-room at once safe and adequate, by the enlargement and fortification of the Peiraeus. Peiraeus and Munychia, in his new plan, constituted a fortified space as large as the enlarged Athens, and with a wall far more elaborate and unassailable. The wall which surrounded

²⁸ Special topic: How Themistocles by deceit got the walls built.

them, sixty stadia in circuit, was intended by him to be so stupendous, both in height and thickness, as to render assault hopeless, and to enable the whole military population to act on ship-board, leaving only old men and boys as a garrison. We may judge how vast his project was, when we learn that the wall, though in practice always found sufficient, was only carried up to half the height which he had contemplated. In respect to thickness however his ideas were exactly followed: two carts meeting one another brought stones which were laid together right and left on the outer side of each, and thus formed two primary parallel walls, between which the interior space was filled up "not with rubble, in the usual manner of the Greeks, but constructed, throughout the whole thickness, of squared stones, cramped together with metal." The result was a solid wall, probably not less than fourteen or fifteen feet thick.²⁹

For an instant, after the battles of Plataea and Mycale³⁰—when the town of Plataea was set apart as a consecrated neutral spot for an armed confederacy against the Persian, with periodical solemnities and meetings of deputies—Sparta was exalted to be the chief of a full Pan-Hellenic union. And had Sparta been capable either of comprehensive policy, of self-directed and persevering efforts, or of the requisite flexibility of dealing, embracing distant Greeks as well as near, her position was now such, that her own ascendancy, together with undivided Pan-Hellenic union,

²⁹ Peiraeus served other purposes besides its direct use as a dockyard for military marine. Its secure fortifications and the protection of the Athenian navy, were calculated to call back those metics or resident foreigners, who had been driven away by the invasion of Xerxes, and who might feel themselves insecure in returning unless some new and conspicuous means of protection were exhibited. Much of the trading, professional and handicraft business was in their hands: and the Athenian legislation, while it excluded them from the political franchise, was in other respects equitable and protective to them. In regard to trading pursuits, the metics had this advantage over the citizens—that they were less frequently carried away for foreign military service. The great increase of their numbers from this period forward helps us to explain the extraordinary prosperity prevalent throughout the country before the Peloponnesian war. The barley, vegetables, figs, and oil, produced in most parts, the fish obtained in abundance near the coast—all found opulent buyers and a constant demand from the augmenting town population. (Grote.)

³⁰ a naval victory for the Greeks off the coast of Asia Minor, near Samos.

might long have been maintained. But she was lamentably deficient in all the requisite qualities, and the larger the union became, the more her deficiency stood manifest. On the other hand, Athens, now entering into rivalry as a sort of leader of opposition, possessed all those qualities in a remarkable degree, over and above that actual maritime force which was the want of the day.

But the sympathies of the Peloponnesians still clung to Sparta, while those of the Ionian Greeks had turned to Athens: and thus not only the short-lived symptoms of an established Pan-Hellenic union, but even all tendencies towards it, from this time disappear. There now stands out a manifest schism, with two pronounced parties, towards one of which nearly all the constituent atoms of the Grecian world gravitate: the maritime states, newly freed from Persia, towards Athens—the land-states, which had formed most part of the confederate army at Plataea, towards Sparta.

THE CONFEDERACY OF DELOS

The Ionic allies were at this time not merely willing and unanimous, but acted as the forward movers in the enterprise of organizing a new confederacy; for they stood in obvious need of protection against the attacks of Persia, and had no further kindness to expect from Sparta or the Peloponnesians. The general conditions of the confederacy were regulated in a common synod of the members, appointed to meet periodically in the temple of Apollo and Artemis at Delos—of old the venerated spot for the religious festivals of the Ionic cities, and at the same time a convenient centre for the members. A definite obligation, either in equipped ships of war or in money, was imposed upon every separate city, and the Athenians, as leaders, determined in which form contribution should be made by each. Their assessment must of course have been reviewed by the synod. They had no power at this time to enforce any regulation not approved by that body.

It had been the good fortune of Athens to profit by the craft

of Themistocles on two recent critical occasions; it was no less her good fortune now—when unimpeachable honesty in the assessor was the first of all qualities—not to have Themistocles, but to employ in his stead the well-known honesty of Aristéides.

Respecting the first assessment we scarcely know more than one single fact—the aggregate in money was 460 talents [a talent was about \$1150.]. Of the individual cities which paid it, of the distribution of obligations to furnish ships and to furnish money, we are entirely ignorant. So large a total implies, from the very first, a great number of contributing states and we learn from hence to appreciate the powerful, wide-spread, and voluntary movement which then brought together the maritime and insular Greeks distributed throughout the Aegean sea and the Hellespont.

The Phoenician fleet, and the Persian land-force, might at any moment reappear, and there was no hope of resisting either except by confederacy; so that confederacy under such circumstances became with these exposed Greeks not merely a genuine feeling, but at that time the first of all their feelings. It was their common fear, rather than Athenian ambition, which gave birth to the alliance; and they were grateful to Athens for organizing it. How the confederacy came to be turned afterwards to the purposes of Athenian ambition, we shall soon see; but in its origin it was an equal alliance in so far as alliance between the strong and the weak can ever be equal—not an Athenian empire.

There is every reason to believe that Athens, as president, for a long time performed her duty in a legitimate and honourable manner, exacting from every member the regulated quota of men or money, employing coercion against recusants, and visiting neglect of military duty with penalties. In all these requirements she only discharged her appropriate functions as chosen leader of the confederacy.

But after a few years, several of the confederates, becoming weary of personal military service, prevailed upon the Athenians to provide ships and men in their place, and imposed upon themselves in exchange a money-payment of suitable amount. To un-

warlike allies, hating labor and privation, it was a welcome relief; while to the Athenians, full of ardor and patient of labor, it afforded constant pay for a fleet more numerous than they could otherwise have kept afloat. It is plain from the statement of Thucydides that this altered practice was introduced from the petition of the confederates themselves, not from any pressure or stratagem on the part of Athens. But though such was its real source, it did not the less fatally degrade the allies in reference to Athens, and extinguish the original feeling of equal rights and partnership in the confederacy. The Athenians came to consider themselves as military chiefs and soldiers, with a body of tribute-paying subjects.

Under such circumstances, several of the confederate states grew tired of paying their tribute—and averse to continuance as members. They made successive attempts to secede: but Athens acting seemingly in conjunction with the synod, repressed their attempts one after the other, conquering, fining, and disarming the revolvers; which was the more easily done since in most cases their naval force had been in great part handed over to her. As these events took place, not all at once, but successively in different years,—the number of mere tribute-paying allies as well as of subdued revolvers continually increasing—so there was never any one moment of conspicuous change in the character of the confederacy. The allies slid unconsciously into subjects, while Athens, without any pre-determined plan, passed from a chief into a despot. By strictly enforcing the obligations of the pact upon unwilling members, and by employing coercion against revolvers, she had become unpopular in the same proportion as she acquired new power—and that too without any guilt of her own. In this position, even if she had been inclined to relax her hold upon the tributary subjects, considerations of her own safety would have deterred her from doing so; for there was reason to apprehend that they might place their strength at the disposal of her enemies.

It was in the nature of things that the confederacy should either break up, or be transformed into an Athenian empire.

As yet, there was no manifest conflict between the maritime power of Athens and the union of land-force under Sparta; but we may imagine the violent reaction which took place in Athenian feeling, when the Lacedaemonians repaid them by singling out their troops from all the other allies as objects of insulting suspicion.³¹

THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR

The Athenians immediately passed a formal resolution to renounce the alliance between themselves and Lacedaemon against the Persians. They did more: they looked out for land-enemies of Lacedaemon, with whom to ally themselves. Of these by far the first, both in Hellenic rank and in real power, was Argos. Thessaly and the town of Megara also obtained permission to enrol themselves as allies of Athens.

Though Athens had not yet been guilty of unjust encroachment against any Peloponnesian state, her ambition and energy had inspired universal awe; while the maritime states in the neighborhood, such as Corinth, Epidaurus, and Ægina, saw these terror-striking qualities threatening them at their own doors, through her alliance with Argos and Megara. Moreover, it is

³¹ An earthquake near Sparta in 464 B. C. was believed to be the judgment of the earth-shaking god Poseidon for a recent violation of his sanctuary at Taenarus, from whence certain suppliant Helots had been dragged away not long before for punishment. An earthquake construed as divine vengeance for Helot blood recently spilt, was sufficient to rouse many of them at once into revolt. They occupied and fortified the memorable hill of Ithome. After the siege against the Helots had lasted two or three years, without any prospect of success, the Lacedaemonians, beginning to despair, invoked the aid of various allies among whom were the Athenians. The Athenian troops are said to have consisted of 4000 men, under the command of Cimon. So imperfect were the means of attacking walls at that day, even for the most intelligent Greeks, that this increased force made no immediate impression on the fortified hill of Ithome. And when the Lacedaemonians saw that their Athenian allies were not more successful than they had been themselves, they soon passed from surprise into doubt, mistrust, and apprehension. The troops had given no ground for such a feeling, while Cimon their general was notorious for his attachment to Sparta. Yet the Lacedaemonians could not help suspecting the energy and ambition of the Athenians, and began to fear that the Athenians might turn against them, and espouse the cause of the besieged. Under the influence of such apprehensions, they dismissed the Athenian contingent forthwith, on pretence of having no further occasion for them; while all the other allies were retained, and the siege or blockade went on as before. (Grote.)

probable that the ancient feud between the Athenians and the Æginetans, though dormant since a little before the Persian invasion, had never been appeased or forgotten: so that the Æginetans, dwelling within sight of Peiræus, were at once best able to appreciate, and most likely to dread, the enormous maritime power now possessed by Athens. Pericles³² was wont to call Aegina the eyesore of Peiræus: but we may be sure that Peiræus, grown into a vast fortified port within the existing generation, was in a much stronger degree the eyesore of Aegina.

In the great naval battle which ensued off the island of Aegina, the superiority of the new nautical tactics acquired by twenty years' practice of the Athenians since the Persian war was demonstrated by a victory most complete and decisive. The maritime power of Aegina was irrecoverably ruined.³³

Splendid as the success of the Athenians had been both on land and sea, it was easy for them to foresee that the power of their enemies would presently be augmented by the Lacedæmonians taking the field. Partly on this account, partly because of the long-sighted views of Pericles, which were now becoming ascendant in the city—the Athenians began the stupendous undertaking of connecting Athens with the sea by means of long walls. Coming as an immediate sequel of great recent victories, and while Aegina was prostrate and under blockade, it excited the utmost alarm among the Peloponnesians—being regarded as the second great stride, at once conspicuous and of lasting effect, in Athenian ambition, next to the fortification of Peiræus.

Athens was now at peace both abroad and at home, under the administration of Pericles, with a great empire, a great fleet, and a great accumulated treasure. The common fund collected from the contributions of the confederates, and originally deposited at Delos, had before this time been transferred to the acropolis at Athens. At what precise time such transfer took place, we cannot

³² Special topic: The life and influence of Pericles.

³³ The war between Athens and Aegina is often called the First Peloponnesian War.

state. Nor are we enabled to assign the successive stages whereby the confederacy, chiefly with the freewill of its own members, became transformed from a body of armed and active warriors under the guidance of Athens, into disarmed and passive tributaries defended by the military force of Athens: from allies free, meeting at Delos, into subjects isolated, sending their annual tribute, and awaiting Athenian orders. The magnitude of the annual tribute Athens received, and still more the character of the Athenians themselves, superior to all Greeks in that combination of energy and discipline which is the grand cause of progress, threatened still further increase.

Formidable as the Athenian empire both really was and appeared to be, however, the widespread feeling of antipathy proved still stronger, so that instead of the threatened increase, the empire underwent a most material diminution. There was at this time a considerable body of exiles, all bitterly hostile to Athens, and ready to join in any attack upon her power. These various exiles, all joining their forces and concerting measures with their partisans in the interior, succeeded in getting control of much territory. Nothing short of extreme temporary despondency could have induced the Athenian assembly to accept the inglorious peace which followed. A truce for thirty years was concluded with Sparta and her allies, in the beginning of 445 B. C., whereby Athens abandoned Peloponnesus altogether and left the Megarians to be included among the Peloponnesian allies of Sparta.

SECOND PELOPONNESIAN WAR

Nearly the whole of the Grecian world (putting aside Italian, Sicilian and African Greek) was at this time included either in the

[Athens in her greatness is a study that might well occupy years. During twenty-five centuries the world has looked to Athens for inspiration in architecture in sculpture, in literature and in philosophy. The architects of the Parthenon and other great buildings of Athens, the sculptors Phidias and Praxiteles, the dramatists Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, the thinkers, Plato, Socrates (see p. 128), and Aristotle,—these are a few of the names that we still reverence. Something of their work should be given in special topics.]

alliance of Lacedaemon or in that of Athens, so that the truce of thirty years ensured a suspension of hostilities everywhere. Moreover, it seemed established, as practical law, that neither of these two aggregate bodies should intermeddle with the other, and that each should restrain or punish its own disobedient members.

Before the recent hostilities at Korcyra³⁴ it had been evident to reflecting Greeks that prolonged observance of the Thirty Years' Truce was becoming uncertain, and that the mingled hatred, fear, and admiration, which Athens inspired throughout Greece would prompt Sparta and the Spartan confederacy to seize any favourable opening for breaking down the Athenian power. The sentiments of the Corinthians towards Athens had now become angry and warlike in the highest degree. Accordingly they lost no time in endeavouring to rouse the feelings of the Spartans against Athens, and in inducing them to invite to Sparta all such of the confederates as had any grievances against that city.

Reviewing the conduct of the two great Grecian parties at this momentous juncture, with reference to existing treaties and positive grounds of complaint, it seems clear that Athens was in the right. She had done nothing which could fairly be called a

³⁴ Trouble having arisen between Corinth and their unwilling ally Korcyra, the island of Korcyra (off the northwestern coast of Greece) begged to join the Athenian alliance. "To comply with the request of the Korcyraeans, by adopting them unreservedly as allies, would have laid the Athenians under the necessity of accompanying them in an attack on Corinth, if required—which would have been a manifest infringement of the truce. Accordingly nothing more was concluded than an alliance for purposes strictly defensive, to preserve Korcyra and her possessions in case they were attacked: nor was any greater force equipped to back this resolve than a squadron of ten triremes, under Lacedaemonius, son of Cimon. The smallness of this force would satisfy the Corinthians that no aggression was contemplated against their city, while it would save Korcyra from ruin. The instructions to Lacedaemonius and his two colleagues were express: not to engage in fight with the Corinthians unless they were actually approaching Korcyra or some Korcyraean possession with a view to attack: but in that case to do his best on the defensive.

The great Corinthian armament of 150 sail soon took its departure. The Korcyraean fleet of 110 sail, together with the ten Athenian ships, took station at one of the adjoining islands. Both sides prepared for battle.

Though at first the ten Athenian ships under Lacedaemonius obeyed the instructions from home in abstaining from actual blows, yet—when the battle became doubtful, and still more, when the Corinthians were pressing their victory—the Athenians could no longer keep aloof, but attacked the pursuers in good earnest and did much to save the defeated Korcyraeans." (Grote.)

violation of the Thirty Years' Truce: while for such of her acts as were alleged to be such, she offered to submit them to that amicable arbitration which the truce itself prescribed. The Peloponnesian confederates were manifestly the aggressors in the contest. Thucydides, seems to consider the fear and hatred of Athens as having contributed more to determine Sparta than the urgency of her allies. That the extraordinary aggrandisement of Athens, during the period immediately succeeding the Persian invasion, was well calculated to excite alarm and jealousy in Peloponnesus, is indisputable. But if we take Athens as she stood in 432 B. C., it deserves notice that she had neither made, nor (so far as we know) tried to make, a single new acquisition during the whole fourteen years which had elapsed since the conclusion of the Thirty Years' Truce,—and moreover that the truce marked an epoch of signal humiliation and reduction of her power.

It was a moment full of difficulty to Pericles at Athens. He had to proclaim to all the proprietors in Attica the painful truth, that they must prepare to see their lands and houses overrun and ruined; and that their persons, families, and moveable property must be brought in for safety either to Athens, or to one of the forts in the territory—or carried across to one of the neighbouring islands.

From all parts of Attica the residents flocked within the spacious walls of Athens, which now served as shelter for the houseless, like Salamis forty-nine years before—entire families with all their moveable property, and even with the woodwork of their houses. The sheep and cattle were conveyed to Euboea and the other adjoining islands.

Pericles was naturally the great object of complaint and wrath. He was denounced as the cause of all the existing suffering. He was reviled as a coward for not leading out the citizens to fight, in his capacity of general. But no manifestations, however violent could disturb either the judgment or the firmness of Perikles.³⁵

³⁵ Special topic: Pericles and the war.

However, he fitted out a powerful expedition, which sailed forth to ravage Peloponnesus, even while the invaders were yet in Attica.

The Plague

At the close of one year the belligerent parties in Greece remained in an unaltered position as to relative strength. Nothing decisive had been accomplished on either side, either by the invasion of Attica, or by the flying descents round the coast of Peloponnesus.

A second devastation of Attica was resolved upon by the Lacedaemonians for the commencement of spring; and measures were taken for carrying it all over that territory, since the settled policy of Athens not to hazard a battle with the invaders was now ascertained. About the end of March or beginning of April, the entire Peloponnesian force (two-thirds from each confederate city as before) was assembled under the command of Archidamus, king of Sparta, and marched into Attica. This time they carried the work of systematic destruction not merely near to Athens, as before; but also to the more southerly portions of Attica. They traversed and ravaged both the eastern and the western coast, remaining not less than forty days in the country. They found the territory deserted as before, all the population having retired within the walls.

In regard to this second invasion, Pericles recommended the same defensive policy as he had applied to the first. But a new visitation had now occurred, diverting their attention from the invader, though enormously aggravating their sufferings. A few days after Archidamus entered Attica, a pestilence or epidemic sickness broke out unexpectedly at Athens.

It appears that this terrific disorder had been raging for some time throughout the regions round the Mediterranean; having begun, as was believed, in Ethiopia—thence passing into Egypt and Libya, and overrunning a considerable portion of Asia under the Persian government. About sixteen years before, too, there

had been a similar calamity in Rome and in various parts of Italy. Recently, it had been felt in Lemnos and some other islands of the Ægean, yet seemingly not with such intensity as to excite much notice generally in the Grecian world: at length it passed to Athens, and first showed itself in the Peiræus.

The progress of the disease was as rapid and destructive as its appearance had been sudden; while the extraordinary accumulation of people within the city and long walls, in consequence of the presence of the invaders in the country, was but too favourable to every form of contagion. Families, crowded together in close cabins and places of temporary shelter, transmitted the disorder with fatal facility from one to the other. Beginning as it did about the middle of April, the increasing heat of summer further aided the disorder. Of this plague—or (more properly) eruptive typhoid fever, distinct from, yet analogous to, the smallpox—a description no less clear than impressive has been left by the historian Thucydides, himself not only a spectator but a sufferer.

Beginning in Peiræus, it quickly passed into the city, and both the one and the other was speedily filled with sickness and suffering, the like of which had never before been known. The seizures were sudden, and a large proportion of the sufferers perished after deplorable agonies on the seventh or on the ninth day.

When it was found that neither the priest nor the physician could retard the spread, or mitigate the intensity, of the disorder, the Athenians abandoned themselves to despair, and the space within the walls became a scene of desolating misery. Every man attacked with the malady at once lost his courage—a state of depression, itself among the worst features of the case, which made him lie down and die, without any attempt to seek for preservatives. And though at first friends and relatives lent their aid to tend the sick with the usual family sympathies, yet so terrible was the number of these attendants who perished, “like sheep,” from such contact, that at length no man would thus expose himself; while the most generous spirits, who persisted longest in the discharge of their duty, were carried off in the greatest numbers.

The patient was thus left to die alone and unheeded. Sometimes all the inmates of a house were swept away one after the other, no man being willing to go near it. There remained only those who, having had the disorder and recovered, were willing to tend the sufferers.

Three years altogether did this calamity desolate Athens: continuously, during the entire second and third years of the war—after which followed a period of marked abatement for a year and a half: but it then revived again, and lasted for another year, with the same fury as at first. No efforts of the Peloponnesians could have done so much to ruin Athens, or to bring the war to a termination such as they desired: and the distemper told the more in their favour, as it never spread at all into Peloponnesus, though it passed from Athens to some of the more populous islands. The Lacedaemonian army was withdrawn from Attica somewhat earlier than it would otherwise have been, for fear of taking the contagion.³⁶

The Peace of Nicias

The deputies of all the allies were convoked at Sparta for discussion with the envoys of Athens, and such discussion was continued during the whole autumn and winter after the battle of Amphipolis (424 B. C.), without any actual hostilities on either side. At first the pretensions advanced were very conflicting; but at length, after several debates, it was agreed to treat upon the basis of each party surrendering what had been acquired by war.

At the beginning of spring—about the end of March, 421 B. C.—the important treaty was concluded for the term of fifty years.³⁷

³⁶ Athens was victorious several times during the following eight years (at Korcyra, Pylos, Cythera and Misaea) but was defeated in Boeotia and at Amphipolis. Special topic: The revolt and treatment of Mitylene (April 428 B. C.)

³⁷ But the Peace of Nicias proved a failure. Trouble arose about the carrying out of the conditions of the treaty.

THE SICILIAN EXPEDITION
SOMETIMES CALLED THE THIRD PELOPONNESIAN WAR

Alkibiades son of Kleinias took this opportunity of putting himself at the head of the vehement anti-Laconian sentiment which now agitated the Ekklesia.

The present is the first occasion on which we hear of this remarkable man as taking a prominent part in public life. Such was the splendour, wealth, and antiquity of his family, that he stepped speedily and easily into a conspicuous station. He was related to Perikles, who became his guardian when he was left an orphan at about five years old. But even his boyhood was utterly ungovernable, and Athens was full of his freaks and enormities, to the unavailing regret of Pericles. His violent passions, love of enjoyment, ambition of pre-eminence, and insolence towards others, were manifested at an early age, and never deserted him throughout life. Moreover, the beauty of his earlier youth, while going through the ordinary gymnastic training, procured for him caresses and compliments from the leading Athenians who frequented the public palaestrae. These men not only endured his petulance, but were even flattered when he would condescend to bestow it upon them. Amidst such universal admiration and indulgence it was not likely that either self-restraint or regard for the welfare of others would ever acquire development in the mind of Alkibiades.

He strikes the schoolmaster whose house he happens to find unprovided with a copy of Homer; he strikes Taureas, a rival choregus, in the public theatre, while the representation is going on; he strikes Hipponikus (who afterwards became his father-in-law), out of a wager of mere wantonness, afterwards appeasing him by an ample apology; he protects the Thasian poet Hegemon, against whom an indictment had been formally lodged before the archon, by effacing it with his own hand from the list put up in the public edifice; defying both magistrate and accuser to press the cause on for trial.

Amidst such unprincipled exorbitances of behaviour, Alki-

biades stood distinguished for personal bravery. He served as a hoplite in the army at the siege of Potidaea in 432 B. C. Though then hardly twenty years of age, he was among the most forward soldiers in the battle, received a severe wound, and was in great danger, owing his life only to the exertions of Socrates, who served in the ranks along with him. His intimacy with Socrates is commemorated both by Plato and Xenophon. Like Themistokles—whom he resembled as well in ability and vigour as in want of public principle and in recklessness about means—Alkibiades was essentially a man of action. But his career affords a memorable example of splendid qualities both for action and command, ruined and turned into instruments of mischief by his utter want of morality, public and private.

He began to put himself forward as a party leader, seemingly not long before the peace of Nikias.

[The following account of the Sicilian expedition is taken from Thucydides who was living at the time, and is considered the first scientific historian.]

The same winter (416 B. C.) the Athenians wished to sail again to Sicily, with a larger armament, and bring it into subjection to them, if they could; the mass of people being ignorant of the size of the island, and the number of its inhabitants, both Greeks and barbarians; and that they were undertaking a war not much inferior in magnitude to that with the Peloponnesians. For the voyage round Sicily in a merchant vessel is one of not much less than eight days. . . .

On the fifth day after this, an assembly was again held, to consider in what way the preparations for the ships should be most quickly made, and whatever else was wanted by the generals be voted them for the expedition.³⁸ Nikias then, who had been chosen against his will to take the command, and thought that the state was not well advised, but was coveting the whole of Sicily, came forward with a wish to divert the Athenians from it. Of the Athenians, the greater part who came forward advised making the expedition; though there were some also who spoke against it.

³⁸ We omit all the discussion; the speeches of Nikias and Alcibiades, however, as reported by Thucydides, form an interesting debate.

But the man who most earnestly recommended the expedition was Alcibiades, who at once wished to thwart Nicias, and was most anxious to take the command, and hoped by that means to reduce Sicily and Carthage, and at the same time, in consequence of his success, to promote his own private interests in point of fame and wealth. For he indulged his inclinations on too large a scale for his existing means, with regard to keeping horses, and all other expenses. And this too was what afterwards mainly caused the destruction of the Athenian state.

At last one of the Athenians came forward, and calling on Nicias, said that he ought to say now before them all, what forces the Athenians should vote him. He then, though reluctantly, said they should not sail with less than a hundred triremes, with not fewer than five thousand heavy armed in all.

The Athenians, after hearing him, immediately voted that the generals ³⁹ should be invested with full powers to make arrangements, both concerning the number of troops, and everything connected with the whole expedition, as they might judge to be best for Athens.

In the meantime, of all the stone Hermes in the city of Athens, (they are, according to the fashion of the country, those well-known square figures, numerous both in private and sacred doorways), the greater part had their faces mutilated in one night. The perpetrators of this offence were known to no one; but search was made for them, with great rewards for information offered at the public expense. And they took the matter up more seriously than it deserved; for it was considered to be an omen of the expedition.

In this charge they implicated Alcibiades; and those took it up who were most hostile to him, as being an obstacle to their own taking the permanent lead of the people. He at once defended himself against these charges, and was ready to submit to trial, as to his being guilty of any of these things, before going on the expedition, (for by this time all things necessary for the armament

³⁹ Alcibiades was one.

had been provided), and if he had done any of these things, he was willing to be punished; but if he were acquitted, to take the command. But his enemies, being afraid of the army, lest he should have its good wishes, if at once brought to trial, wished to put it off. For they wished to have him sent for, and brought home for trial on a graver charge, which they could more easily get up in his absence. Accordingly it was resolved that Alcibiades should sail.

This armament which first sailed out, going from a single city, and consisting of a Grecian force, was the most costly and splendid of all up to that time. The fleet was elaborately fitted out, at great expense both on the part of the captains and of the state. For the treasury gave a drachma⁴⁰ a day to each seaman, and furnished empty vessels, sixty fast sailers and forty transports; while the captains provided the best crews for them, and gave gratuities in addition to the pay from the treasury, each one of them being in the highest degree desirous that his own ship should excel most in beauty and fast sailing.⁴¹

[The very tragic story of how, soon after the Athenian fleet reached Sicily, Alcibiades was called home for trial, of how instead he went to Sparta, and of how the Athenians suffered a terrible defeat at Syracuse Sicily, owing largely to the superstition and incompetence of Nicias, may be given in special topics. The final defeat of Athens by Sparta in the naval battle of Aegospotami, near the Hellespont, can also be given as a special topic. We give in a footnote part of the speech of Alcibiades at Sparta, as given by Thucydides.]⁴²

⁴⁰ eight pence, or about sixteen cents.

⁴¹ Now when the ships were manned, and everything was put on board that they meant to set sail with, silence was proclaimed by trumpet, and they offered the prayers which are usual before putting out to sea; not ship by ship singly, but all together, responding to a herald; having mixed bowls of wine through the whole armament, and both seamen and their officers making oblations with gold and silver goblets. They were joined also in their prayers by the rest of the multitude on shore, both the citizens and whoever else was there that wished them well. When they had sung their hymn, and finished their libations, they weighed anchor; and having at first sailed out in a column, they then raced each other as far as Aegina. And thus they hastened to reach Corcyra, where the remaining force of the allies was also assembling. (Quoted from Thucydides.)

⁴² In the Lacedaemonian assembly, the Corinthians, the Syracusans, and Alcibiades, by urging the same request, prevailed on the people there. Alcibiades came forward, and instigated the Lacedaemonians by addressing them as follows:

Never was a victory⁴³ more complete in itself, more overwhelming in its consequences, or more thoroughly disgraceful to the defeated generals taken collectively, than that of Aegospotami.

The great defeat took place about Sept. 405 B. C. It was made known at Peiræus by the *Paralus*, which arrived there during the night, coming straight from the Hellespont. Such a moment of distress and agony had never been experienced at Athens. The terrible disaster in Sicily had become known to the people by degrees, without any authorised reporter; but here was the official messenger, fresh from the scene, leaving no room to question the magnitude of the disaster or the irreparable ruin impending over the city. The wailing and cries of woe, first beginning in Peiræus, were transmitted by the guards stationed on the Long Walls up to the city. "On that night" (says Xenophon) "not a man slept; not merely from sorrow for the past calamity, but from terror for the future."

Though all hope had fled, the pride, the resolution, and the despair of Athens, still enabled her citizens to bear up; nor was it until some men actually began to die of hunger that they sent propositions to entreat peace. We make out little that is distinct respecting these last moments of imperial Athens. We find only

"It is necessary that I should first address you on the subject of the prejudice felt against me, that you may not, through your suspicions, attend to me the less on matters of public interest. There were others, both in times of old and now, who led on the multitude to more evil courses—the very party which also banished me.

We sailed to Sicily, in the first place to subdue the Sicilians, if we could; after them, again, the Italians; and then also to make an attempt on the dominion of the Carthaginians, and on their own city. If either all or most of these schemes proved successful, then we intended to attack the Peloponnese, after bringing here the united force of the Greeks that had joined us in those parts, taking many barbarians into our pay—both Iberians and others of those nations, confessedly the most warlike barbarians of the present day—and building many triremes in addition to what we have, (since Italy contains timber in abundance). Blockading the Peloponnese with these round its coasts, and at the same time attacking it with our soldiers on the land side, after taking some of the cities by storm, and walling in others, we hoped with ease to reduce it, and after that to enjoy the sovereignty of the whole Grecian race." (Quoted from Thucycides.) The class may enjoy thinking out just exactly what it was that prevented Alcibiades from carrying out what he said was his plan for a great Greek empire.

⁴³ We return to Græce,

a heroic endurance displayed, to such a point that numbers actually died of starvation, without any offer to surrender on humiliating conditions.

The peace that was finally granted by Sparta was on the following conditions: That the Long Walls and fortifications of the Peiræus should be destroyed: That the Athenians should evacuate all their foreign possessions, and confine themselves to their own territory: That they should surrender all their ships of war: That they should re-admit all their exiles: That they should become allies of Sparta, following her leadership both by sea and land, and recognising the same enemies and friends.

Athen's downfall had one great cause—we may almost say, one single cause—the Sicilian expedition. The empire of Athens both was, and appeared to be, in exuberant strength when that expedition was sent forth. But the catastrophe of Syracuse was something overpassing in terrific calamity all Grecian experience and all power of foresight.

Nothing in the political history of Greece is so remarkable as the Athenian empire. Nothing but the genius, energy, discipline, and democracy of Athens, could have brought it about. But having once got it, she might perfectly well have kept it; and had she done so, the Hellenic world would have remained so organized as to be able to repel foreign intervention. When we reflect how infinitely superior was the Hellenic mind to that of all surrounding nations and races, and how much more it might perhaps have achieved, if it had enjoyed another century or half-century of freedom, we shall look with double regret on the ruin of the Athenian empire.

THE RULE OF SPARTA

The Thirty Rule Athens

Having trodden out the last spark of resistance, Lysander returned in triumph to Sparta. So imposing a triumph never fell to the lot of any Greek, either before or afterwards. He brought

with him every trireme out of the harbour of Peiraeus, except twelve left to the Athenians as a concession: he brought the prow-ornaments of all the ships captured at Aegospotami and elsewhere; he was loaded with golden crowns, voted to him by the various cities. Imperial Sparta—as she had now become—was as it were personified in Lysander, who was master of almost all the insular Asiatic and Thracian cities, by means of the native Dekarchies.⁴⁴

In execution of their design to root out evil-doers, the Thirty in Athens first laid hands on some of the most obnoxious politicians under the former democracy. The persons thus seized were brought to trial before the new senate appointed by the Thirty. The statement of Isokrates, Lysias, and others—that the victims of the Thirty, even when brought before the senate, were put to death untried—is authentic and trustworthy; many were even put to death by simple order from the Thirty themselves, without any cognisance of the senate.

The Thirty had a Lacedaemonian military force constantly at their command, besides an organised band of youthful satellites and assassins, ready for any deeds of violence; and they proceeded to seize and put to death many citizens, who were so distinguished for their courage and patriotism, as to be likely to serve as leaders to the public discontent. Several of the best men in Athens thus successively perished, while many others fearing a similar fate, fled out of Attica, leaving their property to be confiscated and appropriated by the oligarchs,⁴⁵ who passed a decree of exile against them in their absence.

But it was not only against the lives, properties, and liberties, of Athenian citizens that the Thirty made war. They were not less solicitous to extinguish the intellectual force and education of the city, a project perfectly in harmony both with the sentiment and practice of Sparta. Among the ordinances which they promulgated was one, expressly forbidding every one “to teach the

⁴⁴ Deka is “ten” in Greek; arko is “rule”: Ten men were appointed to rule each of the other Greek cities, while thirty were placed in Athens.

⁴⁵ nobles.

art of words." The edict of the Thirty was in fact a general suppression of the higher class of teachers or professors, above the rank of the elementary teacher of letters, or grammarist. If such an edict could have been maintained in force for a generation, combined with the other mandates of the Thirty—the city out of which Sophocles and Euripides had just died, and in which Plato and Isocrates were in vigorous age (the former twenty-five, the latter twenty-nine), would have been degraded to the intellectual level of the meanest community in Greece.

The dominion of the Thirty continued without any armed opposition made to it, for about eight months from the capture of Athens by Lysander—that is, from about April to December 404 B. C. The measure of their iniquity then became full. They had accumulated against themselves, both in Attica and among the exiles in the circumjacent territories, suffering and exasperated enemies; while they had lost the sympathy of Thebes, Megara, and Corinth—and were less heartily supported by Sparta.

During these eight important months, the general feeling throughout Greece had become materially different both towards Athens and towards Sparta. At the moment when the long war was first brought to a close—fear, antipathy, and vengeance against Athens had been the reigning sentiment. So soon, however, as Athens was humbled, deprived of her fleet and walled port, and rendered harmless, the great bond of common fear which had held the allies to Sparta disappeared; and a sentiment of jealousy and fear of Sparta sprang up in its place.

Everywhere the new Lysandrian dekadarchy superseded the previous governments, whether oligarchical or democratical. As at Athens, so elsewhere; the dekadarchs would begin by putting to death notorious political opponents, under the name of "the wicked men"; they would next proceed to deal in the same manner with men of known honesty and courage, likely to take a lead in resisting oppression.

[We pass over the atrocities committed by the Thirty, the final overthrow of the Thirty, the restoration of a democracy in Athens, Sparta's dealings with Persia,

the alliance between Thebes, Athens, Corinth, and Argos, and the rebuilding of the Long Walls of Athens. One rather unimportant, but very famous, bit of history known as "The retreat of the Ten Thousand" must be told, however. It occurred in 401 B. C. while Sparta was at the head of the Greek states. A younger brother, named Cyrus, of the then reigning king of Persia, Artaxerxes, became angry with his brother and decided to try to get the throne away from him. Though as a satrap he had an army, he sought to get more *hired* soldiers—mercenaries; so he sent to Proxenus, the Boeotian, asking that he bring him as many Greek soldiers as possible. Cyrus, however, did not say that he wished them to go to Persia, but said he wished them for a campaign in Pisidia in southern Asia Minor. Proxenus invited his friend Xenophon, an Athenian gentleman and scholar, to accompany him for the pleasure of the journey. We give part of Xenophon's account of what happened as told in his book *The Anabasis*,⁴⁶

Cyrus at the head of the force, commenced his journey from Sardis, and proceeded through Lydia, Phrygia, to Colossae, and then to Tarsus, a large and wealthy city of Cilicia. Here, Cyrus and the army remained twenty days; for the soldiers refused to proceed farther, as they now began to suspect that they were marching against the king, and said that they had not been hired for this purpose. And Cyrus sent for the Greek captains, and told them that his march was directed to Babylon, against the Great King. . . . He promised to give every man five minae of silver (possibly about \$100.) when they should arrive at Babylon, and their full pay besides. The greatest part of the Grecian force was thus prevailed upon to accompany him. . . .

It was now approaching noon, and the station where he intended to halt was not far off, when a Persian, one of Cyrus's confidential adherents, appeared riding at his utmost speed, with his horse in a sweat, and straightway called out to all whom he met both Persian and Greek, that the king was approaching with a vast army, prepared as for battle. Immediately great confusion ensued; for the Greeks and all the rest imagined that he would fall upon them suddenly, before they could form their ranks; and Cyrus, leaping from his chariot, put on his breastplate, and mounting his horse, took his javelin in his hand, and gave orders for all the rest to arm themselves, and to take their stations, each in his own place. . . .

It was now mid-day, and the enemy was not yet in sight. But when it was afternoon, there appeared a dust, like a white cloud, and not long after, a sort of blackness, extending to a great distance over the plain. Presently, as they approached nearer, brazen armor began to flash, and the spears and ranks became visible. There was a body of cavalry in white armor on the left. Tissaphernes⁴⁷ was said to have command of them; close by these were troops with wicker shields; and

⁴⁶ The Greek word *anabasis*, "the going up" meant particularly the ascent from the sea-coast to the higher land in the interior of Asia Minor.

⁴⁷ one of Artaxerxes' leading satraps.

next to them, heavy-armed soldiers with long wooden shields reaching to their feet; (these were said to be Egyptians;) then other cavalry and bowmen. These all marched according to their nations, each nation separately in a solid oblong. In front of their line, at considerable intervals from each other, were stationed the chariots called scythed chariots; they had scythes projecting obliquely from the axletree, and others under the driver's seat, pointing to the earth, for the purpose of cutting through whatever came in their way. All these now approached, not with a shout, but with all possible silence, with an even and slow step. . . .

[In the battle that followed, the Greeks were victorious, but Cyrus was killed. Later Tissaphernes (one of Artaxerxes' leading satraps) treacherously offered to lead the Greeks back to their homes, but instead he killed their generals and planned to enslave the army.]

The Greeks were in great perplexity, reflecting that they were not far from the King's gates; that there were all around them, on all sides, many hostile nations and cities; that no one would any longer secure them food; that they were distant from Greece not less than ten thousand stadia; that there was no one to guide them on the way; that impassable rivers would intercept them in the midst of their course; . . . reflecting, I say, on these circumstances, and being disheartened at them, few of them tasted food that evening, few kindled fires, and many lay down to rest where each happened to be, unable to sleep for sorrow and longing for their country, their parents, their wives and children, whom they never expected to see again. . . .

There was in the army a certain Xenophon, an Athenian, who accompanied it neither in character of general, nor captain, nor common soldier, but it happened that Proxenus, an old guest-friend of his, had sent for him from home, giving him the promise that, if he came, he would recommend him to the friendship of Cyrus, who he considered, he said, as a greater object of regard than his own country. . . .

When this perplexity occurred, Xenophon was distressed as well as the other Greeks, and unable to rest. . . . so he arose, and called together in the first place the captains who had been under Proxenus. . . .

When they were assembled, he said, "For my part, captains, I cannot sleep, nor, I should think, can you; nor can I lie still any longer, when I consider in what circumstances we are placed; let us not, then, in the name of heaven, wait for others to come and exhort us to noble deeds, but let us be ourselves the first to excite others to exert their valor. Prove yourselves the bravest of the captains, and more worthy to lead than those who are now leaders. As for me, if you wish to take the start, I am willing to follow you, or, if you appoint me to be the leader, I shall not make my youth an excuse, but shall think myself sufficiently mature to defend myself against harm." Thus spoke Xenophon; and the captains, on hearing him, desired him to be their leader. . . .

[Their journey northward along the Tigris was complicated by continued attacks from the forces of Tissaphernes, by difficulties in crossing rivers, and by snow in the Taurus mountains. At last they came to a town near the Black Sea.]

On the fifth day beyond this city they came to a mountain. When the men who were in the front had mounted the height, a great shout went up; and Xenophon and the rear-guard, on hearing it, thought that some new enemies were assailing the front. But as the noise still increased and drew nearer, and as those who came up from time to time kept running at full speed to join those who were continually shouting, the cries becoming louder as the men became more numerous, it appeared to Xenophon that it must be something of great moment. Mounting his horse, therefore, and taking with him the cavalry, he hastened forward to give aid, when presently they heard the soldiers shouting, "The sea, the sea!" and cheering one another. They then all began to run, the rear-guard as well as the rest; and when they had all arrived at the top, the men embraced one another and their generals and captains with tears in their eyes. . .

[Thence partly by sea, partly by land, they finally reached Byzantium, Thrace, and finally Pergamos on the coast of Asia Minor, and then their homes.]

SOCRATES

[While Sparta was in power Socrates was brought to trial and made to drink the cup of poison. We quote a little from the *Dialogues* of Plato who was a pupil of Socrates.]

Socrates. May not this be the reason, Euthyphro, why I am charged with impiety—that I can not away with these stories about the gods? and therefore I suppose that people think me wrong.

Euthyphro. Yes, Socrates. . . .

Socrates. And do you really believe that the gods fought with one another, and had dire quarrels, battles, and the like, as the poets say, and as you may see represented in the works of great artists?

Euthyphro. Yes, Socrates. . . .

From the Apology:

How you have felt, O men of Athens, at hearing the speeches of my accusers, I cannot tell; but I know that their persuasive words almost made me forget who I was:—such was the effect of them; and yet they have hardly spoken a word of truth. But many as their falsehoods were, there was one of them which quite amazed me:—I mean when they told you to be upon your guard, and not to let yourselves be deceived by the force of my eloquence. They ought to have been ashamed of saying this, because they

were sure to be detected as soon as I opened my lips and displayed my deficiency: they certainly did appear to be most shameless in saying this, unless by the force of eloquence they mean the force of truth; for then I do indeed admit that I am eloquent. . . .

I will begin at the beginning, and ask: What do the slanderers say? They shall be my prosecutors, and I will sum up their words in an affidavit. "Socrates is an evil-doer, and a curious person, who searches into things under the earth and in heaven, and he makes the worse appear the better cause; and he teaches the afore-said doctrines to others." And although some of you may think that I am joking, I declare that I will tell you the entire truth. Men of Athens, this reputation of mine has come of a certain sort of wisdom which I possess. . . .

They say that Socrates is a doer of evil, and a corruptor of the youth, and he does not believe in the gods of the state, and has other new divinities of his own. . . .

I should like to know, Meletus, in what I am affirmed to corrupt the young. I suppose you mean, as I infer from your indictment, that I teach them not to acknowledge the gods which the state acknowledges, but some other new divinities or spiritual agencies in their stead. These are the lessons which corrupt the youth, as you say.

Yes, that I say emphatically.

Then, by the gods, Meletus, of whom we are speaking, tell me and the court, in somewhat plainer terms, what you mean! for I do not as yet understand whether you affirm that I teach others to acknowledge some gods, and therefore do believe in gods, and am not an entire atheist—this you do not lay to my charge;—but only that they are not the same gods which the city recognizes—the charge is that they are different gods. Or, do you mean to say that I am an atheist simply, and a teacher of atheism?

I mean the latter—that you are a complete atheist.

That is an extraordinary statement, Meletus. Why do you say that? Do you mean that I do not believe in the godhead of the sun or moon, which is the common creed of all men?

I assure you, judges, that he does not believe in them; for he says that the sun is stone, and the moon earth.

And so, Meletus, you really think that I do not believe in any god?

I swear by Zeus that you believe absolutely in none at all.

But no one who has a particle of understanding will ever be convinced by you that the same men can believe in divine and

superhuman things, and yet not believe that there are gods and demigods and heroes.

Some one will say: And are you not ashamed, Socrates, of a course of life which is likely to bring you to an untimely end? To him I may fairly answer: There you are mistaken: a man who is good for anything ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing anything he is doing right or wrong—acting the part of a good man or of a bad.

Strange, indeed, would be my conduct, O men of Athens, if I who, when I was ordered by the generals whom you chose to command me at Potidaea and Amphipolis and Delium, remained where they placed me, like any other man, facing death; if, I say now, when, as I conceive and imagine, God orders me to fulfil the philosopher's mission of searching into myself and other men, I were to desert my post through fear of death, or any other fear; that would indeed be strange, and I might justly be arraigned in court for denying the existence of the gods, if I disobeyed the oracle because I was afraid of death: then I should be fancying that I was wise when I was not wise. For this fear of death is indeed the pretence of wisdom and not real wisdom, being the appearance of knowing the unknown; since no one knows whether death, which they in their fear apprehend to be the greatest evil, may not be the greatest good. Is there not here conceit of knowledge, which is a disgraceful sort of ignorance? And this is the point in which, as I think, I am superior to men in general, and in which I might perhaps fancy myself wiser than other men,—that whereas I know but little of the world below, I do not suppose that I know: but I do know that injustice and disobedience to a better, whether God or man, is evil and dishonorable, and I will never fear or avoid a possible good rather than a certain evil. . . .

Some one may wonder why I go about in private giving advice and busying myself with the concerns of others, but do not venture to come forward in public and advise the state. I will tell you the reason of this. You have often heard me speak of an oracle or sign which comes to me, and is the divinity which Meletus ridicules in the indictment. This sign I have had ever since I was a child. The sign is a voice which comes to me and always forbids me to do something which I am going to do, but never commands me to do anything, and this is what stands in the way of my being a politician. And rightly, as I think, For I am certain, O men of Athens, that if I had engaged in politics I should have perished long ago, and done no good either to you or to myself. . . .

Friends, who would have acquitted me, I would like also to talk with you about this thing which has happened, while the magistrates are busy, and before I go to the place at which I must die. Stay then awhile, for we may as well talk with one another while there is time. You are my friends, and I should like to show you the meaning of this event which has happened to me. O my judges—for you I may truly call judges—I should like to tell you of a wonderful circumstance. Hitherto the familiar oracle within me has constantly been in the habit of opposing me even about trifles, if I was going to make a slip or error about anything; and now as you see there has come upon me that which may be thought, and is generally believed to be the last and worst evil. But the oracle made no sign of opposition, either as I was leaving my house and going out in the morning, or when I was going up into this court, or while I was speaking, at anything which I was going to say; and yet I have often been stopped in the middle of a speech, but now in nothing I either said or did touching this matter has the oracle opposed me. What do I take to be the explanation of this? I will tell you. I regard this as proof that what has happened to me is a good, and that those of us who think that death is evil are in error. This is a great proof to me of what I am saying, for the customary sign would surely have opposed me had I been going to evil and not to good. . . .

Wherefore, O judges, be of good cheer about death, and know this of a truth—that no evil can happen to a good man, either in life or after death. He and his are not neglected by the gods; nor has my own approaching end happened by mere chance. But I see clearly that to die and be released was better for me; and therefore the oracle gave no sign. For which reason, also, I am not angry with my accusers or my condemners; they have done me no harm, although neither of them meant to do me any good; and for this I may gently blame them. . . .

The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways—I to die, and you to live. Which is better God only knows.

THEBES GAINS THE POWER

We now enter upon the period when, for the first time, Thebes begins to step out of the rank of secondary powers, and gradually raises herself into a primary and ascendent city in Grecian politics.

Epaminondas

Thebes found among her citizens a leader of the rarest excellence. It is the first time that Epaminondas begins to stand out in the public life of Greece. His family, poor rather than rich, was among the most ancient in Thebes. He seems to have been of middle age. He had discharged with punctuality those military and gymnastic duties which were incumbent on every Theban citizen. But we are told that in the gymnasia he studied to acquire the maximum of activity rather than of strength. He sought with eagerness the conversation of the philosophers within his reach, among whom were two former companions of Socrates; so that the stirring influence of the Socratic method would thus find its way to the mind of Epaminondas. As the relations between Thebes and Athens, ever since the close of the Peloponnesian war, had become more and more friendly, growing at length into alliance and joint war against the Spartans—we may reasonably presume that he profited by teachers at the latter city as well as at the former. Little moved by personal ambition, and never cultivating popularity by unworthy means, Epaminondas was still more indifferent on the score of money. He remained in contented poverty to the end of his life, not leaving enough to pay his funeral expenses.

[At the battle of Leuktra (in Boeotia, in July 371 B. C.) Epaminondas, as leader of the Theban army, entirely overcame the Spartan army which was marching on Thebes.]

In all communities, the return of so many defeated soldiers would have been a scene of mourning. But in Sparta it was filled with grave and dangerous consequences. So terrible was the scorn and ignominy heaped upon the Spartan citizen who survived a defeat, that life became utterly intolerable to him. The mere fact sufficed for his condemnation, without any inquiry into justifying or extenuating circumstances. No citizen at home would speak to him or be seen consorting with him in tent, game, or chorus; no other family would intermarry with his; if he were seen walking about with an air of cheerfulness, he was struck and ill-used by the passers-by, until he assumed that visible humility which was

supposed to become his degraded position. Such rigorous treatment helps to explain the satisfaction of the Spartan father and mother, when they learned that their son was among the slain and not among the survivors.

The invincible arm of Sparta was broken; she had not a man to spare for the maintenance of foreign ascendancy. Her harmosts disappeared at once and returned home. Nor was this all. The Lacedaemonian ascendancy had been maintained everywhere by local oligarchies or dekachies, which had been for the most part violent and oppressive. Against these governments, now deprived of their foreign support, the long-accumulated flood of internal discontent burst with irresistible force, stimulated probably by returning exiles. Their past misgovernment was avenged by severe sentences and proscription, to the length of great reactionary injustice.

[There followed jealousies and battles between cities and states including Aegean territory and involving relations with Persia. Finally Epaminondas made a last incursion into the Peloponnesus and established his camp at Tegea in Laconia. At the battle of Mantinea (362 B. C.) he defeated the Peloponnesians but was himself fatally wounded.]

Scarcely any character in Grecian history has been judged with so much unanimity as Epaminondas. He has obtained a meed of admiration—from all sincere and hearty—from some enthusiastic. Cicero pronounced him to be the first man of Greece. The remark has often been made, and suggests itself whenever we speak of Epaminondas, that without him the dignity and commanding influence of Thebes both began and ended.

The conflicts already recounted wrought the melancholy change of leaving Greece more disunited, and more destitute of presiding Hellenic authority, than she had been at any time since the Persian invasion. Thebes, Sparta, and Athens, had all been engaged in weakening each other; in which unhappily, each had been far more successful than in strengthening herself. It was under these circumstances so untoward for defence, that the aggressor from Macedonia arose. The collective Hellenic world, for the first

time since the invasion of Xerxes, was about to be thrown upon its defence against a foreign enemy from Macedonia.

PHILIP OF MACEDONIA

The Macedonians were still mountain shepherds, ill-clothed and ill-housed—eating and drinking from wooden platters and cups—destitute to a great degree, not merely of cities, but of fixed residences. The men of substance were armed with breast-plates and made good cavalry; but the infantry were a rabble destitute of order, armed with wicker shields and rusty swords, and contending at disadvantage, though constantly kept on the alert, to repel the inroads of their Illyrian or Thracian neighbors. Among some Macedonian tribes, the man who had never slain an enemy was marked by a degrading badge. These were the men whom Philip on becoming king found under his rule.

Philip was probably occupied for a certain time in making good his dominion over Thessaly. But as soon as sufficient precautions had been taken for this purpose, he sought to push this advantage over the Phocians by invading them in their own territory. He marched to Thermopylae.

The news of such a danger, transmitted to Athens, excited extraordinary agitation. The importance of defending Thermopylae—and of prohibiting the victorious king of Macedon from coming to co-operate with the Thebans on the southern side of it, not merely against the Phocians, but probably also against Attica—were so powerfully felt, that the usual hesitations and delays of the Athenians in respect to military expedition were overcome. Athenian citizens shook off their lethargy, and promptly volunteered. They reached Thermopylae in good time, placing the pass in such a condition of defence that Philip did not attack it at all. Often afterwards does Demosthenes, in combating the general remissness of his countrymen, remind them of this unwonted act of energetic movement, crowned with complete effect. With little or no loss, the Athenians succeeded in guarding both themselves

and their allies against a very menacing contingency, simply by the promptitude of their action.

Yet the king of Macedon had become the ascendent soldier and potentate hanging on the skirts of the Grecian world, exciting fears, or hopes, or both at once, in every city throughout its limits. In the first Philippic of Demosthenes,⁴⁹ we discern evident marks of the terrors which Philip had come to inspire, within a year after his repulse from Thermopylae, to reflecting Grecian politicians.

In November 352 B. C., intelligence reached Athens, that Philip was in Thrace, so near to the Chersonese, that the Athenian possessions and colonists in that peninsula were threatened with considerable danger. So great was the alarm and excitement caused by this news, that a vote was immediately passed in the public assembly to equip a fleet of forty triremes and to raise 60 talents by a direct property-tax. But before the difficulties of detail could be surmounted, fresh messengers arrived from the Chersonese, reporting first that Philip had fallen sick, next that he was actually dead. Though the opportunity became thus only the more favourable for attacking Philip, yet the Athenians, no longer spurred on by fear of further immediate danger, relapsed into their former languor, and renounced or postponed their intended armament.

DEMOSTHENES

It was thus that the real sickness, and reported death, of Philip, which ought to have operated as a stimulus to the Athenians by exposing to them their enemy during a moment of peculiar weakness, proved rather an opiate exaggerating their chronic lethargy and cheating them into a belief that no further efforts were needed. That belief appears to have been proclaimed by the leading, best-known, and senior speakers, those who gave the tone to the public assembly, and who were principally relied upon for advice. The serious, but indispensable, duty which they thus

⁴⁹ The Philippics of the great Greek orator Demosthenes are his orations against Philip.

omitted, was performed for them by a younger competitor, far beneath them in established footing and influence—Demosthenes, now about thirty years old—in a harangue known as the first Philippic.

His views indeed were so new, so independent of party-sympathies or antipathies, and so plain-spoken in comments on the past as well as in demands for the future—that they would hardly have been proposed except by a speaker instinct with the ideal of the Periclean foretime, familiar to him from his study of Thucydides.

It is not merely a splendid piece of oratory, emphatic and forcible; profoundly animated with genuine Pan-Hellenic patriotism, and with the dignity of that free Grecian world now threatened by a monarch from without. It has other merits besides, not less important in themselves, and lying more immediately within the scope of the historian. We find Demosthenes, taking accurate measure of the political relations between Athens and Philip. More than twenty years after this period, when Athens had lost the game and was in her phase of humiliation, Demosthenes measures the real extent to which a political statesman is properly responsible. The first of all things is,—“To see events in their beginnings—to discern tendencies beforehand, and proclaim them beforehand to others—to abridge as much as possible the rubs, impediments, jealousies, and tardy movements, inseparable from the march of a free city—and to infuse among the citizens harmony, friendly feelings, and zeal for the performance of their duties.” The first Philippic is alone sufficient to prove how justly Demosthenes lays claim to the merit of having “seen events in their beginnings” and given timely warning to his countrymen.

We know neither the actual course, nor the concluding vote, of this debate, wherein Demosthenes took a part so unexpectedly prominent. But we know that neither of the two positive measures which he recommends was carried into effect.

Olynthus, at length with all its inhabitants and property, fell into the hands of Philip. His mastery of the Chalkidic peninsula

thus became complete—towards the end of winter 348–347 B. C. Miserable was the ruin which fell upon this flourishing peninsula. The persons of the Olynthians—men, women, and children—were sold into slavery. The wealth of the city gave to Philip the means of recompensing his soldiers for the toils of the war; the city itself he is said to have destroyed, together with thirty-two other Chalkidic cities.

Amidst the grief and apprehension which disturbed the Athenian mind, many special assemblies were held to discuss suitable remedies. The gravity of the crisis forced statesmen hitherto languid in the war, to hold a more energetic language than before against Philip. Denouncing him now as the common enemy of Greece, they proposed missions into Peloponnesus and elsewhere for the purpose of animating the Grecian states into confederacy against him. Aeschines assisted strenuously in procuring the adoption of this proposition, and was himself named as one of the envoys into Peloponnesus. This able orator, immortalised as the rival of Demosthenes, proceeded into the Peloponnesus in the spring of 347 B. C.; others being sent at the same time to other Grecian cities.

Yet no sincere or hearty co-operation against Philip could be obtained in any part of Greece. The maintenance of freedom in the Hellenic world now turned once more upon the pass of Thermopylae.

To Philip, that pass was of incalculable importance. It was his only road into Greece. In spite of the general remissness of Athens in warlike undertakings, she had now twice manifested her readiness for a vigorous effort to maintain Thermopylae against him. To become master of the position, it was necessary that he should disarm Athens by concluding peace—keep her in ignorance or delusion as to his real purposes—prevent her from conceiving alarm or sending aid to Thermopylae—and then overawe or buy off the isolated Phocians.

[We omit the story of the visit to Philip of the eleven envoys (two of whom were Demosthenes and Aeschines) and of Philip's deceitful offers of peace.

Grote's very interesting account of the jealousies exhibited by these envoys, of their consequent quarrels and delays during the next three months, of the secret movements of Philip's army, and of the disloyalty and deceit of Aeschines, which induced Athens to sign the peace, fills twenty-two pages.

The envoys were on their way a second time, to receive Philip's oath of peace, when they learned that he had made terms with Thebes, had seized Thermopylae, had taken twenty-two Phocian cities, and seemed to be on the point of subduing all Greece. It was, however, eight years, during which time Demosthenes spoke many times, before Philip finally in the battle of Cheronaea, August 338 B.C., so conquered the Greeks that all the Greek states were forced to recognize Philip's absolute headship.]

It is not easy to conceive a more terrible shock to the traditional sentiment of pride and patriotism, inherited from forefathers, who, after repelling and worsting the Persians, had first organized the maritime Greeks into a confederacy. Such traditional sentiment had still a strong hold upon the imagination and memory of the Greeks, where it had been constantly kept alive by the eloquence of Demosthenes and others. The peace of Demades, recognizing Philip as chief of Greece, was a renunciation of all this proud historical past, and the acceptance of a new and degraded position, for Athens as well as for Greece generally.

Immediate relief from danger, with the restoration of 2000 captive citizens, was sufficient to render the peace popular at the first moment; moreover, the Athenians, as if conscious of failing resolution and strength, were now entering upon that career of flattery to powerful kings, which we shall hereafter find them pushing to disgraceful extravagance. It was probably during the prevalence of this sentiment, which did not long continue, that the youthful Alexander of Macedon—son of Philip—accompanied by Antipater, paid a visit to Athens.

[We omit the story of the assassination of Philip two years later.]

ALEXANDER THE GREAT

At the age of thirteen, Alexander had been placed under the instruction of Aristotle, whom Philip had expressly invited for the purpose, and whose father had been both friend and physician of

Philip's father. What course of study Alexander was made to go through, we unfortunately cannot state. He enjoyed the teaching of Aristotle for at least three years, and we are told that he devoted himself to it with ardor, contracting a strong attachment to his preceptor; moreover, he retained, later, even in the midst of his fatiguing Asiatic campaigns, an interest in Greek literature and poetry.

The sudden death of Philip in the fulness of glory and ambitious hopes, must have produced the strongest impression throughout Macedonia and upon the foreigners whom he had reduced to dependence, from the Danube to the borders of Paeonia. It remained to be proved whether the youthful son of Philip⁵⁰ was capable of putting down opposition and upholding the powerful organization created by his father. But Alexander showed himself both in word and deed perfectly competent for the emergency.

The wish to break loose from Macedonia, widely spread throughout the Grecian cities, found open expression from Demosthenes and others in the assembly at Athens. In other Grecian states also, the death of Philip excited aspirations for freedom.

Apprised of these impulses prevalent throughout the Grecian world, Alexander felt the necessity of checking them by a demonstration immediate as well as intimidating. The energy and rapidity of his proceedings overawed all those who had speculated on his youth. Having surmounted, in a shorter time than was supposed possible, the difficulties of his newly-acquired position at home, he marched into Greece at the head of a formidable army, seemingly about two months after the death of Philip. The details of his march we do not know; but his great force, probably not inferior to that which had conquered at Chaeroneia, spread terror everywhere, silencing all except his partisans. Nowhere was the alarm greater than at Athens. The Athenians, recollecting both the speeches of their orators and the votes of their assembly—offensive at least, if not hostile, to the Macedonians—trembled

⁵⁰ Alexander was barely twenty years old.

lest the march of Alexander should be directed against their city, and accordingly made preparation for standing a siege. At the same time, the assembly adopted, on the motion of Demades, a resolution of apology and full submission to Alexander; they not only recognized him as chief of Greece, but conferred upon him divine honors, in terms even more emphatic than those bestowed on Philip. The mover, with other legates, carried the resolution to Alexander, whom they found at Thebes, and who accepted their submission.

After displaying his force in various portions of Peloponnesus, Alexander returned to Corinth, where he convened deputies from the Grecian cities. He asked from the assembled deputies the same appointment which the victorious Philip had required and obtained two years before—the headship of the Greeks. To the request of a prince at the head of an irresistible army, one answer only was admissible. He was nominated Imperator with full powers, by land and sea. Overawed by the presence and sentiment of Macedonian force, all acquiesced in this vote except the Lacedaemonians.

[We cannot go into detail regarding Alexander's conquest of almost all the known world. That can be seen on a map. Instead we relate a few incidents which are famous and which reveal some of Alexander's really great qualities—his personal bravery, his persistence in overcoming handicaps, and his reverence for literature and art.]

In the spring (335 B. C.) Alexander put himself at the head of a large force, and marched in an easterly direction from Amphipolis, through the narrow pass between Philippi and the sea. At the Danube Alexander resolved to make a display of his strength by crossing the river and attacking the Getae—tribes who occupied the left bank of the river. Accordingly Alexander got together a quantity of the rude boats (hollowed out of a single trunk) employed for transport on the river, and caused the tent-skins of the army to be stuffed with hay in order to support rafts. He then put himself on shipboard during the night, and contrived to carry across the river a body of 4000 infantry, and 1500 cavalry, landing

on a part of the bank where there was high standing wheat and no enemy's post. The Getae, intimidated not less by this successful passage than by the excellent army array of Alexander's army, hardly stayed to sustain a charge of cavalry, but hastened to abandon their poorly fortified town and retire farther away from the river. Before Alexander quitted the northern bank, he offered a sacrifice to Zeus the Preserver—to Heracles—and to the god Ister (Danube) himself, whom he thanked for having shown himself not impassable. On the very same day, he recrossed the river to his camp, to prove that he could do what neither his father nor any Grecian army had ever yet done, and what everyone deemed impossible—crossing the greatest of all known rivers without a bridge and in the face of an enemy.⁵¹

During the long absence of Alexander on his march into Thrace and Illyria, rumors arose of his having been defeated and slain.

Theban exiles at Athens, immediately laid their plan for liberating their city and expelling the Macedonian garrison. They convoked a general assembly of the Thebans, to whom they earnestly appealed for a vigorous effort to expel the Macedonians, and reconquer the ancient freedom of the city. But they were surprised by the awe-striking arrival of Alexander in person in Boeotia at the head of his victorious army. No one could at first believe the fact. The Theban leaders contended that it was another Alexander.

In this incident we may note two features, which characterized Alexander to the end of his life; his matchless celerity of movement, and no less remarkable favor of fortune. He was already within Thermopylae, before any Greeks were aware that he was in march, or even that he was alive.

Two days after his arrival in Boeotia, he marched his army round Thebes. He brought up his battering engines and prepared everything for the storming of the town. Thebes was razed to the

⁵¹ Modern students may doubt details that Grote seems to have believed.

ground. But Alexander left the house of Pindar standing, and spared the descendants of the poet.

The effect produced by the destruction of Thebes was one of unmitigated terror throughout the Grecian cities. All of them sought to make their peace with the conqueror. To the universal deference and submission which greeted him, one exception was found—the Cynic philosopher Diogenes, who resided at Corinth, satisfied with a tub for shelter, and with the coarsest and most self-denying existence. Alexander approached him with a numerous suite, and asked if he wished for anything; upon which Diogenes is said to have replied,—“Nothing except that you would stand a little out of my sunshine.” Both the philosopher and his reply provoked laughter from the bystanders, but Alexander himself was so impressed with the independent and self-sufficing character manifested, that he exclaimed,—“If I were not Alexander, I would be Diogenes.”

Having visited the oracle of Delphi, and received or extorted from the priestess an answer bearing favorable promise for his Asiatic schemes, he returned to Macedonia before the winter. He never saw Greece again. The whole of Alexander’s remaining life—from his crossing the Hellespont in March or April 334 B. C. to his death at Babylon in June 323 B. C., eleven years and two or three months—was passed in Asia.

It is not merely in soldierlike qualities—in the most forward and even adventurous bravery—in indefatigable personal activity and in endurance as to hardship and fatigue,—that he stands pre-eminent; his long-sighted plans for the prosecution of campaigns, his constant foresight and resource against new difficulties, together with rapidity of movement even in the worst country—all on a scale of prodigious magnitude—are without parallel in ancient history.

It was about February or March 333 B. C. when Alexander reached Gordium⁵² where he performed the memorable exploit familiarly known as the cutting of the Gordian knot. There was

⁵² An interesting special topic may be “Alexander at Troy.”

preserved in the citadel an ancient wagon of rude structure, said by the legend to have belonged to the peasant Gordius and his son Midas—the primitive rustic kings of Phrygia. The cord attaching the yoke of this wagon to the pole, was so twisted and entangled as to form a knot which no one had ever been able to untie. An oracle had pronounced, that to the person who should untie it the empire of Asia was destined. When Alexander went up to see this ancient relic, the surrounding multitude, Phrygian as well as Macedonian, were full of expectation that the conqueror of the Granikus⁵³ would overcome the difficulties of the knot and acquire the promised empire. But Alexander, on inspecting the knot, was as much perplexed as others had been before him, until at length, in a fit of impatience, he drew his sword and severed the cord in two. By everyone this was accepted as a solution of the problem, thus making good his title to the empire of Asia; a belief which the gods ratified by a storm of thunder during the ensuing night.

Towards the close of the siege of Tyre, Alexander received and rejected a second proposition from Darius, offering 10,000 talents, with the cession of all the territory westward of the Euphrates. "If I were Alexander (said Parmenio⁵⁴ I should accept such terms instead of plunging into further peril."—"So would I (replied Alexander) if I were Parmenio; but since I am Alexander, I must return a different answer."

The two sieges of Tyre and Gaza, which occupied both together nine months, were the hardest fighting that Alexander ever had encountered, or in fact ever did encounter throughout his life. After such toils, the march to Egypt, which he now commenced (October 332 B. C.), was an affair of holiday and triumph.⁵⁵

It was late in 324 B. C. or early in 323 B. C. that Alexander commenced his progress to Babylon; but in slow marches retarded

⁵³ Where he defeated the Persians.

⁵⁴ Alexander's general, friend and chief adviser, then nearly seventy years old.

⁵⁵ Special topics: Alexander's siege of Gaza; his founding of the city of Alexandria.

by various foreign embassies which met him on the road. So widely had the terror of his name and achievements been spread, that several of these envoys came from most distant regions. There were some from the various tribes of Libya—from Carthage—from Sicily and Sardinia—from the Illyrians and Thracians—from the Lucanians, Bruttians, and Tuscans, in Italy—nay, even (some affirmed) from the Romans, as yet a people of moderate power. But there were other names yet more surprising—Æthiopians, from the extreme south, beyond Egypt—Scythians from the north, beyond the Danube—Iberians and Gauls, from the far west, beyond the Mediterranean Sea.

In the midst of this exuberant pride and good fortune, however, dark omens and prophecies crowded upon him as he approached Babylon. Of these the most remarkable was, the warning of the Chaldean priests, who apprised him, soon after he crossed the Tigris, that it would be dangerous for him to enter that city, and exhorted him to remain outside of the gates. At first he was inclined to obey; but his scruples were overruled, either by arguments from the Greek sophist Anaxarchus, or by the shame of shutting himself out from the most memorable city of the empire, where his great naval preparations were now going on. He found Nearchus with his fleet, who had come up from the mouth of the river,—and also the ships directed to be built in Phoenicia, which had come down the river from Thapsakus, together with large numbers of seafaring men to serve aboard. The ships of cypress wood, and the large docks, which he had ordered to be constructed at Babylon, were likewise in full progress. He lost no time in concerting with Nearchus the details of an expedition into Arabia and the Persian Gulf, by his land-force and naval force co-operating. From various naval officers, who had been sent to survey the Persian Gulf, and now made their reports, he learned that though there were no serious difficulties within it or along its southern coast, yet to double the eastern cape which terminated that coast—to circumnavigate the unknown peninsula of Arabia,—and thus reach the Red sea—was an enterprise perilous at least, if not im-

practicable. But to achieve that which other men thought impracticable, was the leading passion of Alexander. He resolved to circumnavigate Arabia as well as to conquer the Arabians, from whom it was sufficient offence that they had sent no envoys to him.

[But illness came upon him suddenly, and he died in June 323 B. C. The last years of his life were stained with the murder of some of his best friends in drunken anger.]

He had mastered in defiance of fatigue, hardship, and combat, not merely all the eastern half of the Persian empire, but unknown Indian regions beyond its easternmost limits. Besides Macedonia, Greece, and Thrace, he possessed all that immense treasure and military force which had once rendered the Great King [of Persia] so formidable.

Alexander overawes the imagination more than any other personage of antiquity, by the matchless development of all that constitutes effective force—as an individual warrior, and as organiser and leader of armed masses. But all his great qualities were fit for use only against his enemies; in which category indeed were numbered all mankind, known and unknown, except those who chose to submit to him.

Alexander's conquests, however, produced—perhaps the best of all their effects—a great increase of intercommunication, multiplication of roads, extension of commercial dealing, and enlarged facilities for the acquisition of geographical knowledge. His systematic exploration of the earth, combined with increased means of communication among its inhabitants, is the main feature in Alexander's career which presents itself as promising real consequences beneficial to humanity.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ His great empire, after his death, naturally broke up into many of its integral parts. We now turn to Italy where, soon, Rome was to become the great world influence.

XIV—ROME¹

The ancient boundary of Italy on the north was not the Alps but the Apennines. This mountain-system nowhere rises abruptly into a precipitous chain, but, spreading broadly over the land and enclosing many valleys and table-lands connected by easy passes, presents conditions which well adapt it to become the settlement of man.

The west coast presents a far-stretching domain intersected by considerable streams, in particular by the Tiber, and shaped by the action of the waves and of the once numerous volcanoes into manifold variety of hill and valley, harbor and island. Here the regions of Etruria, Latium, and Campania, form the very flower of the land of Italy. The plain of Latium must have been in primeval times the scene of the grandest conflicts of nature, while the slowly formative agency of water deposited, and the eruptions of mighty volcanoes upheaved, the successive strata of that soil on which was to be decided the question to what people the sovereignty of the world should belong.

Here, south of the Tiber, settled the stock which is known to history under the name of the Latins. But the territory occupied by them, the district of Latium, was only a small portion of the central plain of Italy.

All the country north of the Tiber was to the Latins a foreign and even hostile domain, with whose inhabitants, the Etruscans,² no lasting alliance, no public peace, was possible.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ROME

About fourteen miles up from the mouth of the Tiber, hills of moderate elevation rise on both banks of the stream, higher on the

¹ We quote from Mommsen's *History of Rome*, of which Edward A. Freeman, the great English historian, said: "Mommsen's Roman History is, beyond all doubt, to be ranked among those really great historical works which do so much honor to our own day. We can have little hesitation in pronouncing it to be the best complete Roman history in existence."

² Several topics may be given on the Etruscans: what we do not know about them; Their early civilization; Late excavations in Etruria (Tuscany), etc.

north, lower on the south bank. With the latter group there has been closely associated for at least two thousand five hundred years the name of the Romans. We are unable, of course, to tell how or when that name arose.³

The Tiber was the natural highway for the traffic of Latium; and its mouth, on a coast scantily provided with harbors, became necessarily the anchorage of seafarers. Moreover, the Tiber formed from very ancient times the frontier defence of the Latin stock against their northern neighbors. There was no place better fitted for an emporium⁴ of the Latin river and sea traffic, and for a maritime frontier fortress of Latium, than Rome. It combined the advantages of a strong position and of immediate vicinity to the river; it commanded both banks of the stream down to its mouth; it was so situated as to be equally convenient for the river navigator descending the Tiber or the Anio, and for the seafarer with vessels of so moderate a size as those which were then used; and it afforded greater protection from pirates than places situated immediately on the coast.

The history of Italy falls into two main divisions: (1) its internal history down to its union under the leadership of the Latin stock, and (2) the history of its sovereignty over the world.

[We omit the story of how the Latins (Romans) conquered the other tribes south of the Tiber, of how they later conquered the Etruscans, north of the Tiber, and of how they conquered the Greeks who occupied the southeastern part of Italy. The story of how Pyrrhus of Epirus made a last attempt to unite the Greeks, may be given in a special topic.]

We omit also the almost legendary history of Rome under kings. Some of the legends concerning the Tarquins, and some of Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome* may be given as special topics.

The study of the beginnings of the Roman *republic*, (about 500 B.C.), may be limited also to a brief outline of the government, based on a study of the words: Roman Consul, Roman dictator, tribune, censor, quaestor, praetor, Roman senate, patricians, plebeians, etc. "The Twelve Tables" (twelve bronze tablets on which were inscribed the Roman laws) may also be the subject of a special topic.]

³ Special topics: The legend of the founding of Rome by Romulus and Remus; The story of the flight of Aeneas from Troy and his founding of Rome.

⁴ *forum*, or market-place.

ROME BEFORE THE PUNIC WARS

As the Greek when he sacrificed, raised his eyes to heaven, so the Roman veiled his head; for the prayer of the former was contemplation, that of the latter reflection. Throughout the whole of nature he adored the spiritual and the universal. To everything existing, to the man and to the tree, to the state and to the store-room, was assigned a spirit which came into being with it and perished along with it.

The Roman world of gods was a higher counterpart, an ideal reflection, of the earthly Rome, in which the little and the great were alike reproduced with painstaking exactness. As the Roman gods ruled over the Roman community, so every foreign community was presided over by its own gods; and when the citizens of a conquered city were transported to Rome, the gods of that city were also invited to take up their new abode there.

Of all the worships of Rome that which perhaps had the deepest hold was the worship of the spirits that presided in and over the household and the storechamber: these were in public worship Vesta and the Penates, in family worship the gods of the forest and field, the Silvani, and especially the gods of the household in its strict sense, the Lases or Lares, to whom their share of the family meal was regularly assigned, and before whom it was, even in the time of Cato the Elder, (c. 200 B. C.) the first duty of the father of the household on returning home to perform his devotions. In the ranking of the gods, however, these spirits of the house and of the field occupied the lowest rather than the highest place.

Respecting the world of spirits little can be said. The departed souls of mortal men, the "good" (manes), continued to exist as shades haunting the spot where the body reposed, and received meat and drink from the survivors. But they dwelt in depths beneath, and there was no bridge that led from the lower world either to men ruling on earth or upward to the gods above.

Economic Conditions

Agriculture was, and remained, the social and political basis of the Roman community. The common assembly and the army consisted of Roman farmers; what as soldiers they had acquired by the sword, they secured as colonists by the plough.

Respecting the internal intercourse of the Italians with each other our written authorities are silent; coins alone furnish some information. In Italy, with the exception of the Greek cities and of the Etruscan Populonia, there was no coinage during the first three centuries of Rome, and cattle in the first instance, and subsequently copper by weight, served as the medium of exchange.

It was usual in antiquity, and was in fact a necessary consequence of slavery, that the minor trades in towns were very frequently carried on by slaves, whom their master established as artisans or merchants; or by freedmen, in whose case the master not only frequently furnished the capital, but also regularly stipulated for a share, often the half, of the profits. Retail trading and dealing in Rome were undoubtedly constantly on the increase; and there are proofs that the trades which minister to the luxury of great cities began to be concentrated in Rome. But as the net proceeds even of retail business flowed for the most part into the coffers of the great houses, no industrial and commercial middle-class arose to an extent corresponding to that increase.

From the importance which the Roman commonwealth attached to the possession of land, and from its constituting the sole basis of political privileges, it was undoubtedly at this period usual for the fortunate speculator to invest part of his capital in land. But while neither a rich middle class nor a body of capitalists grew up in Rome, it was constantly acquiring more and more the character of a great city. This is plainly indicated by the increasing number of slaves crowded together in the capital (as attested by the very serious slave conspiracy of 419 B. C.), and still more by the increasing multitude of freedmen.

A similar indication of the rising importance of urban life in Rome is presented by the great development of the urban police. To this period probably belong in great measure the enactments

under which the four aediles divided the city into four police districts, and made provision for the discharge of their equally important and difficult functions—for the efficient repair of the network of drains small and large by which Rome was pervaded, as well as of the public buildings and places; for the proper cleansing and paving of the streets; for preventing the nuisances of ruinous buildings, dangerous animals, or foul smells; for the removing of wagons from the highway except during the hours of evening and night, and generally for the keeping open of the communication; for the uninterrupted supply of the market of the capital with good and cheap grain; for the destruction of unwholesome articles, and the suppression of false weights and measures; and for the special oversight of baths, and taverns.

In architecture the regal period, particularly the epoch of the great conquests, probably accomplished more than the first two centuries of the republic. It was Appius Claudius who in his epoch-making censorship (312 B. C.) threw aside the antiquated rustic system of parsimonious hoarding, and taught his fellow-citizens to make worthy use of the public resources. He began that noble system of public works of general utility, which even now in its ruins furnishes some idea of the greatness of Rome to thousands on thousands who have never read a page of her history. To him the Roman state was indebted for its first great military road, and the city of Rome for its first aqueduct. Following in the steps of Claudius, the Roman senate wove around Italy a network of roads and fortresses.

The style of living also among the citizens now was altered. Chroniclers date the disappearance of shingle roofs in Rome from 284 B. C.; and about the same time silver plate began to make its appearance on Roman tables. Now too the new capital of Italy began to embellish itself.

THE PUNIC WARS

Of all the Phoenician⁵ settlements none attained a more rapid

⁵ The Phoenicians were Semites. The English word Phoenician is, of course, much later than the name by which the Greeks called them Phœnices or the Latin name Puni.

and secure prosperity than those which were established by the Tyrians and Sidonians on the south coast of Spain and the north coast of Africa.

Among the numerous and flourishing Phoenician cities along these shores, the most prominent by far was the "New Town," Karthada or Karchedon or Carthago. It was situated not far from the former mouth of the Bagradas (Mejerda), which flows through the richest corn district of Northern Africa, and was placed on a fertile rising ground, still occupied with country houses and covered with groves of olive and orange trees, falling off in a gentle slope towards the plain, and terminating in a sea-girt promontory. Lying in the heart of the great North African roadstead, the Gulf of Tunis, at the very spot where that beautiful basin affords the best anchorage for vessels of larger size, and where drinkable spring water is got close by the shore, the place proved singularly favorable for agriculture and commerce and for the exchange of their respective commodities—so favorable, that not only was the Tyrian settlement in that quarter the first of Phoenician mercantile cities, but even in the Roman period Carthage was no sooner restored than it became the third city in the empire, and still, under circumstances far from favorable and on a site far less judiciously chosen, there exists and flourishes in that quarter a city of a hundred thousand inhabitants.*

In Sicily the straits of Messina and the larger eastern half of the island had fallen at an early period into the hands of the Greeks; but the Carthaginians retained the smaller adjacent islands, and kept the west and northwest coast of Sicily, whence they maintained communication with Africa.

The First Punic War

For upwards of a century the feud between the Carthaginians and the rulers of Syracuse had devastated the beautiful island of Sicily.

In the second great city on the east coast, Messina, a band of foreign soldiers had established themselves, and held the city,

*The city of Tunis in 1931 had a population of 202,405.

independent alike of Syracusans and Carthaginians. These new rulers of Messina were mercenaries, Mamertines or "Men of Mars," as they called themselves, who soon became the third power in the island.

[Finally, rather than be conquered by Syracuse, the city of Messina decided to offer to Rome possession of their "sea-commanding fortress."]

It was a moment of deepest significance in the history of the world, when the envoys of the Mamertines appeared in the Roman senate. No one indeed could then anticipate all that was to depend on the crossing of that narrow arm of the sea; but that the decision, however it should go, would involve consequences more important than had attached to any decree hitherto passed by the senate, must have been manifest to every one of the fathers of the city assembled in council. It was one of those moments when calculation fails, and when faith in men's own and in their country's destiny alone gives them courage to grasp the hand which beckons to them out of the darkness of the future, and to follow it they know not whither. Long and seriously the senate deliberated on the proposal.

[If the Carthaginians controlled Messina, Roman ships bound for the east might be compelled to sail around Sicily. It was, therefore, natural that Rome should decide to take Messina. The Carthaginians were of course angry and declared war against Rome.]

The Romans now for the first time felt the real difficulties of the war. If as we are told, the Carthaginian diplomatists before the outbreak of hostilities warned the Romans not to push the matter to a breach, because against their will no Roman could even wash his hands in the sea, the threat was well founded. The Carthaginian fleet ruled the sea without a rival, and not only kept the coast towns of Sicily in due obedience, but also threatened a descent upon Italy.

The Romans now saw that everything depended on procuring a fleet, and resolved to form one of twenty triremes and a hundred quinqueremes.

The happy idea occurred to the Romans that they might make up for what their vessels, with their unpractised officers and crews, necessarily lacked in ability of manoeuvring, by again assigning a more considerable part in naval warfare to the soldiers. They stationed at the prow of each vessel a flying bridge, which could be lowered in front or on either side; it was furnished on both sides with parapets, and had space for two men in front. When the enemy's vessel was sailing up to strike the Roman one, or was lying alongside of it after the thrust had been evaded, the bridge on deck was suddenly lowered and fastened to its opponent by means of a grappling-iron: this not only prevented the running down, but enabled the Roman marines to pass along the bridge to the enemy's deck and to carry it by assault as in a conflict on land. No distinct body of marines was formed, but land troops were employed, when required, for this maritime service.

Rome had suddenly become a naval power, and held in her hand the means of energetically terminating a war which threatened to be endlessly prolonged and to involve the commerce of Italy in ruin.

[But nineteen years of warfare on the sea followed, and the Romans saw fleet after fleet of theirs destroyed. Then by private subscription they got two hundred ships manned by 60,000 sailors, and defeated the Carthaginians in 241 B.C.]

The Second Punic War

The treaty with Rome in 241 B. C. gave to the Carthaginians peace, but they paid for it dearly. That the tribute of the largest portion of Sicily now flowed to Rome instead of to the Carthaginian treasury, was the least part of their loss. They felt a far keener regret when they found that they had to abandon the hope of monopolising all the lines of traffic between the eastern and the western Mediterranean, just as that hope seemed on the eve of fulfilment. They now beheld their whole system of commercial policy broken up, the southwestern basin of the Mediterranean, which they had hitherto exclusively commanded, converted since

the loss of Sicily into an open thoroughfare for all nations, and the commerce of Italy rendered completely independent of the Phoenicians. Nevertheless the possessions which they retained, Africa, Spain, and the gates of the Atlantic ocean, were sufficient to confer power and prosperity. But in truth, where was the security that these would continue in their hands?

[The second Punic war was begun by the famous Carthaginian general, Hannibal, who had the stupendous idea of taking an army from Spain across the Pyrenees into Gaul, across the Rhone river, across the snow-covered Alps, and of surprising the Romans by a sudden invasion from the north. We give a few details of Hannibal's journey as told by the great Roman historian Livy (59 B. C.-17 A. D.)]

Various plans, I should suppose, were projected for conveying the elephants across the river [Rhone], at least the accounts transmitted of the manner in which it was performed are various. Some relate that being brought all together to the river side, the fiercest among them was provoked to anger by his keeper, who pursued him by swimming as he fled into the water: that this drew down the rest of the herd; and that each, as soon as he lost the bottom, was by the mere force of the stream hurried to the opposite bank. But it is more generally agreed, that they were carried over on rafts; and as this must have appeared the safer method, it is now more easy to believe that the business was so effected. One raft, of two hundred feet in length and fifty in breadth, was extended from the bank into the river, the upper part of it being firmly fastened to the shore with several strong cables, to prevent its being carried down with the stream, and this was covered with a layer of earth, like a bridge, in order that the beasts might, without fear, walk on it as on solid ground. Another raft of equal breadth and one hundred feet long was fastened to this, and when the elephants, being over the fixed raft, passed over to the smaller one which was joined to it, then the ropes with which this latter had been slightly tied were instantly loosed, and it was towed away by several light vessels to the other bank. When the first were thus landed, it was brought back for the rest. As long as they were driven, as it were

on a bridge connected with the land, they showed no signs of fear; they first began to be frightened when, the raft being set loose, they were separated from the rest, and dragged into the deep; then pressing close on one another, as those on the outside drew back from the water, they occasioned a good deal of disorder; but terrified by seeing the water on every side of them, they soon became quiet. Some indeed, becoming outrageous, tumbled into the river, but their own weight rendering them steady, though their riders were thrown off, they cautiously searched out the shallow parts, and came safe to land. . . .

When Hannibal arrived at the Alps, the view exhibited such objects as renewed all the terrors of the men; the height of the mountains, the snows almost touching the sky, the wretched huts standing on the cliffs, the cattle and beasts shivering with cold, the people squalid and uncouth in dress, all things in short, animate and inanimate, stiffened with frost, besides other circumstances more shocking to the sight than can be represented in words. As they marched up the first acclivities, they beheld the eminences which hung over them covered with parties of the mountaineers, who, if they had posted themselves in the valleys out of view and rushing out suddenly had made an unexpected attack, must have occasioned the most terrible havoc and dismay. Hannibal commanded the troops to halt, and having discovered from some Gauls, whom he sent forward to examine the ground, that there was no passage on that side, encamped in the widest valley which he could find, where the whole circuit consisted of rocks and precipices.

At the dawn of the next day, the army began to march forward. But the greatest disorder was occasioned by the horses, which affrighted at the dissonant clamours multiplied by the echoes from the woods and valleys, became nearly unmanageable; and when they happened to receive a stroke or a wound, grew so unruly as to overthrow numbers of men, and heaps of baggage of all sorts; and as there were abrupt precipices on each side of the pass, their violence cast down many to an immense depth so that the fall of such great masses produced a dreadful effect. Although

these were shocking sights to Hannibal, yet he kept his place for a while, and restrained the troops that were with him, lest he should increase the tumult and confusion. Afterwards, seeing the line of the army broken, and that there was danger of their being wholly deprived of their baggage, in which case the effecting of their passage would answer no purpose, he hastened down from the higher ground; and while, by the mere rapidity of his motion, he dispersed the forces of the enemy, he at the same time increased the confusion among his own. But this, when the roads were cleared by the flight of the mountaineers, was instantly remedied, and the whole army was soon brought through the pass not only without disturbance, but almost without noise. . . .

On the ninth day the army completed the ascent to the summit of the Alps, mostly through pathless tracts and wrong roads, into which they had been led, either by the treachery of their guides, or, when these were not trusted, rashly, on the strength of their own conjectures, following the courses of the valleys.

Tired as the troops were of struggling so long with hardships, they found their terrors very much increased by a fall of snow. The troops were put in motion with the first light; and as they marched slowly over ground which was entirely covered with snow, dejection and despair being strongly marked in every face, Hannibal went forward before the standards, and ordering the soldiers to halt on a projecting eminence, from which there was a wide, extended, prospect, made them take a view of Italy, and of the plains about the Po, stretching along the foot of the mountains; then told them, that they were now scaling the walls not only of Italy but of the city of Rome. That all the rest would be plain and smooth, and after one, or at most, a second battle, they would have the bulwark and capital of Italy in their power and disposal. The army then began to advance. But the way was much more difficult than it had been in the ascent; the declivity, on the Italian side of the Alps being in most places shorter and consequently more perpendicular; while the whole way was narrow and slippery, so that the soldiers could not prevent their feet from sliding, nor,

if they made the least false step, could they on falling stop themselves in the place; and thus men and beasts tumbled promiscuously over one another.

In this manner, as nearly as can be ascertained, they accomplished their passage into Italy in the fifth month, according to some authors, after leaving New Carthage,⁷ having spent fifteen days in crossing the Alps.

[We omit the account of the battle of Lake Trasimene (see map) where the surprised Roman army suffered defeat. Special topics should be assigned on the Roman dissatisfaction with their cautious dictator Quintus Fabius, on the over confidence of the new consuls and the consequent terrible defeat of the Romans at Cannae (216 B. C.), on the fifteen long years that followed during which Hannibal could not take Rome because he had no siege machinery with which to batter down the city wall, and on how, finally, a great Roman general, Publius Scipio, by attacking Carthage *drew* Hannibal out of Italy. Thus the second Punic war (218–202 B. C.) ended in the battle of Zama, with victory for the Romans. We now return to Mommsen.]

Thus ended the second Punic, or as the Romans more correctly called it, the Hannibalic war, after it had devastated the land and islands from the Hellespont to the Pillars of Hercules for seventeen years. Before this war the policy of the Romans had no higher aim than to acquire command of the mainland of Italy, and of the Italian islands and seas; it is clearly proved by their treatment of Africa on the conclusion of peace that they also terminated the war with the impression, not that they had laid the foundation of a universal empire, but that they had rendered a dangerous rival harmless. The Romans achieved the sovereignty of Italy because they strove for it; the sovereignty over the territories of the Mediterranean was to a certain extent thrown into the hands of the Romans by the force of circumstances without intention on their part to acquire it.

[But Rome's next war was an inexcusable effort to destroy a rival city.]

The Burning of Carthage (the Third Punic War)

The order of things established by the Romans in Libya rested

⁷ Cartagena, Spain.

in substance on a balance of power between the nomad kingdom of Massinissa and the city of Carthage. While the former was enlarged, confirmed, and civilized under the vigorous and sagacious government of Massinissa, Carthage, in consequence simply of a state of peace, became once more, at least in wealth and population, what it had been at the height of its political power. The Romans saw with ill-concealed and envious fear the apparently indestructible prosperity of their old rival; while hitherto they had refused to grant to it any real protection against the constantly repeated encroachments of Massinissa, they now began openly to interfere in his favor.

Old Marcus Cato, at that time perhaps the most influential man in the Roman senate and a veteran survivor from the Hannibalic war, was still filled with thorough hatred and thorough dread of the Phoenicians. With surprise and jealousy Cato had seen with his own eyes the flourishing state of the hereditary foes of Rome, the luxuriant country and the crowded streets, the immense stores of arms in the magazines and the rich materials for a fleet; already he in spirit beheld a second Hannibal wielding all these resources against Rome. In his honest and manly, but thoroughly narrow-minded, fashion, he came to the conclusion that Rome could not be secure until Carthage had disappeared from the face of the earth.

Those of the aristocracy whose ideas were more enlarged, opposed this paltry policy with great earnestness; and showed how blind were the fears entertained regarding a mercantile city whose Phoenician inhabitants were becoming more and more disused to warlike arts and ideas, and how the existence of that rich commercial city was quite compatible with the political supremacy of Rome. Even the conversion of Carthage into a Roman provincial town might have been practicable, and indeed, compared with the present condition of the Phoenicians, perhaps even not unwelcome. Cato, however, desired not the submission, but the destruction of the hated city. His policy, as it would seem, found some supporters. At length a majority of the Roman senate resolved that

at the first fitting opportunity—respect for public opinion required that they should wait for such—they would bring about war with Carthage, or rather the destruction of the city.

[A pretext, rather than a cause, was soon found. Under the semblance of arranging for peace, Rome made Carthage surrender her arms and give as hostages three hundred children from the leading families.

Finally, however, the Carthaginians were told that in accordance with the instructions given by the Roman senate, Carthage was to be destroyed, but that the inhabitants were at liberty to settle anew wherever they chose, provided it were at a distance of at least ten miles from the sea.]

The fearful command aroused in the Phoenicians—shall we say magnanimous or frenzied? enthusiasm. Unparalleled as was the patience with which this nation could endure bondage and oppression, as unparalleled was now the tumultuous fury of that mercantile and seafaring population, when the things at stake were not the state and freedom, but the beloved soil of their ancestral city and their venerable and dear home beside the sea. Hope and deliverance were out of the question; the voice of the few who counselled the acceptance of what was inevitable was, like the call of the pilot during a hurricane, drowned amidst the furious yells of the multitude; which, in its frantic rage, laid hands on the magistrates of the city who had counselled the surrender of hostages and arms, made such of the innocent bearers of the news as had ventured at all to return home expiate their terrible tidings, and tore in pieces the Italians who chanced to be sojourning in the city. No resolution was taken to defend themselves; even unarmed as they were, this was a matter of course. The gates were closed; stones were carried to the battlements of the walls that had been stripped of the catapults; the chief command was entrusted to a grandson of Massinissa; the slaves in a body were declared free...

At the same time, concealing in true Phoenician style the most unbounded resentment under the cloak of humility, they attempted to deceive the enemy. A message was sent to the Roman consuls to request a thirty days' armistice for the despatch of an embassy to Rome. The consuls, in the natural supposition

that after the first outbreak of despair the utterly defenceless city would submit, postponed the attack. The precious interval was employed in preparing catapults and armor; day and night all, without distinction of age or sex, were occupied in constructing machines and forging arms; the public buildings were torn down to procure timber and metal; the women cut off their hair to furnish the strings indispensable for the catapults; in an incredibly short time the walls and the men were once more armed. That all this could be done without the consuls, who were but a few miles off, learning anything of it, is not the least marvellous feature in this marvellous movement animated by a truly enthusiastic and in fact superhuman national hatred. When at length the consuls, weary of waiting, broke up their camp at Utica, and thought that they should be able to scale the naked walls with ladders, they found to their surprise and horror the battlements crowned anew with catapults, and the large, populous city, which they hoped to occupy like an open village, able and ready to defend itself to the last man.

Carthage was rendered very strong both by the nature of its situation and by the art of its inhabitants, who had very frequently to depend on the protection of its walls. Into the broad gulf of Tunis there projects in a direction from west to east a promontory, which is encompassed on three sides by the sea, and is connected with the mainland only towards the west. On its southern portion lay the city of Carthage. On the wall along the west and landward side, where nature afforded no protection, every appliance within the power of the art of fortification in those times was expended. It consisted, as its recently discovered remains,⁸ exactly tallying with the description of Polybius, have shown, of an outer wall of six and a half feet in thickness and immense casemates⁹ constructed behind this wall probably along its whole extent.

The consuls accordingly had by no means an easy task to perform, when they found themselves compelled to commence a

⁸ Special topic: Recent excavations at the site of ancient Carthage.

⁹ fortifications.

regular siege. The Romans now resorted to the extraordinary measure of entrusting the conduct of the war to the only man who had as yet brought home honor from the Libyan plains, and who was recommended for this war by his very name. Instead of calling Scipio Aemilianus to the aedileship for which he was a candidate, they gave him the consulship before the usual time, setting aside the law, and committed to him by special decree the conduct of the African war. He arrived (147 B. C.) in Utica at a very critical moment.

Scipio took up his headquarters on the ridge by which the Carthaginian peninsula was connected with the mainland, and, notwithstanding the various attempts of the Carthaginians to disturb his operations, constructed a great camp across the whole breadth of the isthmus, which completely shut off the city from the landward side. Nevertheless ships with provisions still ran into the harbor. Scipio therefore constructed a stone mole, ninety-six feet broad, running from the tongue of land between the lake of Tunis and gulf into the latter, so as thus to close the mouth of the harbor. The city seemed lost, when the success of this undertaking, which was at first ridiculed by the Carthaginians as impracticable, became evident. But one surprise was balanced by another. While the Roman labourers were constructing the mole, work was going forward night and day for two months in the Carthaginian harbor. All of a sudden, just as the Romans had completed the bar across the entrance to the harbor, fifty Carthaginian triremes and a number of boats and skiffs sailed forth from that same harbor into the gulf. While the Romans were stopping up the old mouth of the harbor towards the south, the Carthaginians had by means of a canal formed in an easterly direction procured for themselves a new outlet, which owing to the depth of the sea at that spot could not possibly be closed. Had the Carthaginians, instead of resting content with a mere demonstration, thrown themselves at once and resolutely on the half-dismantled and wholly unprepared Roman fleet, it must have been lost; when they returned the third day to give battle, they found

the Romans in readiness. The conflict came off without decisive result.

Winter had now arrived and Scipio suspended his operations, leaving famine and pestilence to complete what he had begun.

How fearfully these mighty agencies had laboured in the work of destruction during the interval appeared so soon as the Roman army proceeded in the spring of 146 B. C. to attack the inner town. Finally¹⁰ Scipio gave orders to set fire to the captured streets and to level the ruins. Then at last the remnant of the population, crowded together in the citadel, besought for mercy. Life was barely conceded to them, and they appeared before the victor, 30,000 men and 25,000 women, not the tenth part of the former population.

The joy in the camp and in Rome was boundless; the noblest of the people alone were in secret ashamed of the most recent achievement of the nation.

But by far the larger portion of the city remained standing. We may believe that Scipio desired its preservation; at least he addressed a special inquiry to the senate on the subject. The senate, however, ordered Scipio to level the city of Carthage with the ground, and to do the same with all the places which had held by Carthage to the last; and thereafter to pass the plough over the site of Carthage so as to put an end in legal form to the existence of the city, and to curse the soil and site forever, that neither house nor cornfield might ever reappear on the spot. The command was punctually obeyed. The ruins burned for seventeen days; recently, when the remains of the Carthaginian city wall were excavated, they were found to be covered with a layer of ashes from four to five feet deep, filled with half-charred pieces of wood, fragments of iron and projectiles. Where the industrious Phoenicians had bustled and trafficked for five hundred years, Roman slaves henceforth pastured the herds of their distant masters. Scipio, however, whom nature had destined for a nobler part than that of an executioner, gazed with horror on his own

¹⁰ A special topic giving more details would be interesting.

work; and, instead of the joy of victory, the victor himself was haunted by a presentiment of the retribution that would inevitably follow such a misdeed.

ROMAN PROBLEMS

Government of the Provinces

If we glance back at the career of Rome, the universal empire of Rome, far from appearing as a gigantic plan contrived and carried out by an insatiable thirst for territorial aggrandisement, appears to have been a result which forced itself on the Roman government without, and even in opposition to, its wish.¹¹ The policy of Rome throughout was not projected by a single mighty intellect and bequeathed by tradition from generation to generation; it was the policy of a very able but somewhat narrow minded deliberative assembly, which had far too little power of grand combination, and far too much of an instinctive desire for the preservation of its own commonwealth, to devise projects in the spirit of a Caesar or a Napoleon. The universal empire of Rome had its ultimate ground in the political development of antiquity in general. The ancient world knew nothing of a balance of power among nations; and therefore every nation which had attained internal unity strove either directly to subdue its neighbors, as did the Hellenic states, or at any rate to render them harmless, as Rome did,—an effort it is true, which also issued at last in subjugation.

The provinces, Sicily perhaps excepted, probably cost nearly as much as they yielded; the expenditure on highways and other structures rose in proportion to the extension of territory. Very considerable losses arose from the mismanagement, negligence, or connivance of the supreme magistrates—[i.e. the governors of the provinces]. Of the conduct of these officials, of their luxurious living at the expense of the public purse, of their embezzlement more especially of the spoil, of the incipient system of bribery and

¹¹ Probably this is not the common opinion. As Rome had burned Carthage from needless fear and jealousy, so her conquest of Macedonia, Greece, Syria, Palestine, and Gaul seems to the average reader to arise from lust for power.

extortion, we can read.¹² The Roman governor, placed at the head of the armies of the state, far more resembled a Persian satrap than one of the commissioners of the Roman senate.

Playing the part of governors demoralized the Roman ruling class with fearful rapidity. Haughtiness and arrogance towards the provincials were so natural in the circumstances, as scarcely to form matter of reproach against the individual magistrate. But already it was a rare thing—and the rarer because the government adhered rigidly to the old principle of not paying public officials—that a governor returned with quite clean hands from his province.

The Government in Rome

The dominion of Rome extended over the three continents; the lustre of the Roman power and the glory of the Roman name were constantly on the increase; all eyes rested on Italy, all talents and all riches flowed thither; it seemed as if a golden age of peaceful prosperity and intellectual enjoyment of life had there begun. The Orientals of this period told each other with astonishment of the mighty republic of the west, "which subdued kingdoms far and near, so that everyone who heard its name trembled; but which kept good faith with its friends and clients....and there was among them neither envy nor discord."

So it seemed at a distance; matters wore a different aspect on a closer view. The government of the aristocracy was in full train to destroy its own work. There was a profound meaning in the question of Cato, "What was to become of Rome when she should no longer have any state to fear?" That point had now been reached. Every neighbor whom she might have feared was politically annihilated. A younger generation had come to the helm, and their policy was a sorry answer to that question of the

¹² A governor of a province was usually appointed to serve for a year only. In order to get rich in a year, he often levied as high taxes as he could get. The Latin word for tax-collector or revenue-collector is *publicanus* which is translated into English as "publican." Compare the frequent combination of the words "publicans and sinners" in the New Testament.

veteran patriot. In internal affairs they were disposed to let the ship drive before the wind; if we understand by internal government more than the transaction of current business, there was at this period no government in Rome at all. The single thought of the governing corporation was the maintenance and, if possible, the increase of their usurped privileges. It was not the state that had a title to get the right and the best man for its supreme magistracy; but every member of the coterie had an inborn title to the highest office of the state.

With few exceptions the young men belonging to the ruling families crowded into the political career. The first requisite for a public career began, not as formerly in the camp, but in the ante-chambers of influential men. A new and noble body of clients now undertook—what had formerly been done only by dependents and freedmen—to come and wait on their patron early in the morning, and to appear publicly in his train. But the populace also was a great lord, and desired as such to receive attention. The rabble began to demand as its right that the future consul should recognize and honor the sovereign people in every ragged idler of the street, and that every candidate should in his “going round” (*ambitus*) salute every individual voter by name and press his hand. The world of quality readily entered into this degrading canvass. The candidate cringed not only in the palace, but also on the street, and recommended himself to the multitude by flattering attentions, indulgences, and civilities more or less refined. Demagogism and the cry for reforms were sedulously employed to attract the notice and favor of the public. The Romans suffered the grave institutions of criminal justice and of political police to become a means of soliciting office. The provision or, what was still worse, the promise of magnificent popular amusements had long been the, as it were legal, prerequisite to the obtaining of the consulship; now the votes of the electors began to be directly purchased with money, as is shown by the prohibition issued against this about 159 B. C. The government was thus converted from a blessing into a curse for the people.

Honorary privileges were associated with position. Descendants of magistrates were allowed to place wax images of their illustrious ancestors, after their death, in the family hall, along the wall where the pedigree was painted, and to have these images carried, on occasion of the death of members of the family, in the funeral procession. With this privilege were associated various external insignia, reserved by law or custom for such magistrates and their descendants; the stripe of purple on the tunic and the gold finger-ring of the men, the silver mounted trappings of the youths, the purple border on the toga and the golden amulet-case of the boys—trifling matters, but still important in a community where civic equality in external appearance was so strictly adhered to, and where, even during the second Punic war, a burgess was arrested and kept for years in prison because he had appeared in public, in a manner not sanctioned by law, with a garland of roses upon his head. "He who steals from a burgess" said Cato, "ends his days in chains and fetters; but he who steals from the community ends them in gold and purple." Perhaps nothing so clearly evinces the decline of genuine pride and genuine honor in high and low alike as the hunting after insignia and titles, which appeared under different forms of expression, but with substantial identity of character, among all ranks and classes.

What was to be the fate of a commonwealth in which war and peace, the nomination and deposition of the general and his officers, the public chest and the public property, were dependent on the caprice of the multitude and its accidental leaders? The thunderstorm had not yet burst; but the clouds were gathering in denser masses, and occasional peals of thunder were already rolling through the sultry air. Or to choose another figure, wherever we cast our eyes, chinks and rents are yawning in the old building; we see workmen busy sometimes in filling them up, sometimes in enlarging them; but we nowhere perceive any trace of preparations for thoroughly rebuilding or renewing it, and the question is no longer whether, but simply when, the structure will fall.

Amusements

Popular amusements increased to an alarming extent. For five hundred years the community had been content with one festival in the year, and with one circus. The first Roman demagogue by profession, Gaius Flaminius, added a second festival, called the plebeian games, and a second circus (220 B. C.). When the path was once opened, the evil made rapid progress. The festival in honor of Ceres, the goddess who protected the plebeian order, must have been but little, if at all, later; and more followed.

The cost of these new amusements was defrayed by the magistrates. These perhaps excused themselves in their own eyes by the reflection that the festivals were not at any rate a burden on the public purse; but it would have been in reality far less injurious to burden the public budget with a number of useless expenses, than to allow the furnishing of an amusement for the people to become practically a qualification for holding the highest office in the state. The splendor of the games became gradually the standard by which the electors measured the fitness of the candidates for the consulship. The nobility had, in truth, to pay dear for their honors—a gladiatorial show on a respectable scale cost 720,000 sesterces (£7200)—but they paid willingly, since by this means they absolutely precluded men who were not wealthy from a political career.

A very near approach was made to that ideal condition in which every idler should know where he might kill time every day; and this in a commonwealth where formerly action had been with all the very object of existence, and idleness had been proscribed by custom as well as by law.

The bad and demoralizing elements in these festal observances, moreover, daily acquired greater ascendancy. It is true that still as formerly the chariot races formed the brilliant finale of the national festivals. The introduction of Greek comedy and tragedy to Rome formed the best of the acquisitions at this time. The Romans had probably long indulged in the sport of coursing hares and hunting foxes in presence of the public; now these hunts

were converted into formal baitings of wild animals; and the wild beasts of Africa—lions and panthers—were (first so far as can be proved in 186 B. C.) transported at great cost to Rome, in order that by killing or being killed they might serve to glut the eyes of the capital. The still more revolting gladiatorial games now gained admission to Rome; human blood was first shed for sport in the Roman Forum in 264 B. C. Of course these demoralizing amusements encountered severe censure: the consul of 268 B. C. Publius Sempronius, sent a divorce to his wife, because she had attended funeral games; the government managed to procure a decree of the people prohibiting the importation of wild beasts to Rome, and strictly insisted that no gladiators should appear at the public festivals. But here too it wanted either the proper power or proper energy: it succeeded, apparently, in checking the practice of baiting animals, but the appearance of sets of gladiators at private festivals, particularly at funeral celebrations, was not suppressed.

It was by no means the object of the Roman festivals to elevate—though it should be but temporarily—the whole body of spectators through the power of poetry as the Greek stage did in the period of its prime, or to prepare an artistic treat for a select circle, as our theatres endeavor to do¹³. The character of the managers and spectators in Rome is illustrated by a scene at the triumphal games in 167 B. C., where the first Greek flute-players, on their melodies failing to please, were instructed by the director to box with one another instead of playing, upon which the delight knew no bounds.

Luxury

Luxury prevailed more and more in dress, ornaments, and furniture, in buildings and at table.

A multitude of new and for the most part frivolous articles—silver plate elegantly figured, table-couches with bronze mounting, Attalic dresses as they were called, and carpets of rich gold brocade—now found their way to Rome.

¹³ written in 1855.

Above all, this new luxury appeared in the appliances of the table. Poems on the art of good eating, with long lists of the most palatable fishes and other marine products found their readers: and the theory was reduced to practice. Foreign delicacies—anchovies from Pontus, wine from Greece—began to be esteemed in Rome. Hitherto the Romans had perhaps drunk pretty deeply at supper, but drinking-banquets in the strict sense were unknown; now formal revels came into vogue, on which occasions the wine was little or not at all diluted and was drunk out of large cups, and the drinking of healths, in which each was bound to follow his neighbor in regular succession, formed the leading feature—"drinking after the Greek style" or "playing the Greek" as the Romans called it. In consequence of this debauchery, dice-playing, which had long been in use among the Romans, reached such a height that it was necessary for legislation to interfere. The aversion to labor and the habit of idle lounging were visibly on the increase.

As a matter of course, this revolution in life and manners brought an economic revolution in its train. Residence in the capital became more and more coveted as well as more costly. Rents rose to an unexampled height. Extravagant prices were paid for the new articles of luxury; a barrel of anchovies from the Black sea cost 1600 sesterces (£16)—more than the price of a rural slave; a beautiful boy cost 24,000 sesterces (£240)—more than many a farmer's homestead.

Money therefore, and nothing but money, became the watchword with high and low. Men did not, if possible, steal outright; but all shifts were employed in order to attain rapidly to riches—plundering and begging, cheating on the part of contractors, swindling on the part of speculators, and usurious trading in money and in grain. Marriage especially became on both sides a matter of mercantile speculation; marriages for money were common.

When man no longer finds enjoyment in work, and works merely in order to attain as quickly as possible to enjoyment, it is a mere accident that he does not become a criminal. Destiny lavished all the glories of power and riches with liberal hand on

the Romans; but, in truth, the Pandora's box was a gift of doubtful value.

Commerce

The starting-point of the Roman moneyed economy was of course money-lending; and no branch of commercial industry was more zealously prosecuted by the Romans than the trade of the professional money-lender. Already, throughout the whole range of the empire the business of making advances to those who wanted money began to be, so to speak, monopolised by the Romans. Industries remained comparatively undeveloped. Trades were no doubt indispensable, and there appear indications that they were concentrated in Rome.

From the great consumption of woollen stuffs the manufacture of cloth must have been extensive and lucrative. But no endeavors were apparently made to transplant to Italy any such professional industry as existed in Egypt and Syria, or even to carry it on abroad with Italian capital. Flax indeed was cultivated in Italy, and purple dye was prepared there, but the latter branch of industry at least belonged mainly to the Greek Tarentum, and probably the importation of Egyptian linen and Milesian or Tyrian purple even now preponderated everywhere over the native manufacture.

Under this category, however, falls to some extent the leasing or purchase by Roman capitalists of landed estates beyond Italy, with a view to carry on the cultivation of grain and the rearing of cattle on a great scale. This species of speculation, which afterwards developed itself to proportions so enormous, probably began within the period now before us; particularly in Sicily.

The whole gain from these immense transactions of the Roman capitalists flowed in the long run to Rome; for, much as they went abroad, they were not easily induced to settle permanently there, but sooner or later returned to Rome, either realizing their gains and investing them in Italy, or continuing to carry on

business from Rome as a centre by means of the capital and connections which they had acquired. The moneyed superiority of Rome as compared with the rest of the civilized world was, accordingly, quite as decided as its political and military ascendancy.

Slavery

The human labor on the farm was regularly performed by slaves. The slaves were, like the larger cattle, not bred on the estate, but purchased at an age capable of labor in the slave-market; and, when through age or infirmity they had become incapable of working, they were again sent with other refuse to the market.

The whole system of farming was pervaded by the utterly unscrupulous spirit characteristic of the power of capital. Slaves and cattle were placed on the same level; a good watch-dog, it is said in a Roman writer on agriculture, must not be on too friendly terms with his "fellow-slaves." The slave and the ox were fed properly so long as they could work, because it would not have been good economy to let them starve; and they were sold like a worn-out ploughshare when they became unable to work, because in like manner it would not have been good economy to retain them longer.

No attempt was ever made to attach the slaves to the estate or to their master by any bond of human sympathy. The letter of the law in all its naked hideousness regulated the relation, and the Romans indulged no illusions as to the consequences. "So many slaves, so many foes," said a Roman proverb. It was an economic maxim, that dissensions among the slaves ought rather to be fostered than suppressed.

Business was uniformly carried on by means of slaves. Trades were in great part carried on by slaves, so that the proceeds belonged to the master. We need hardly add that the working of mines and manufactories was conducted entirely by slaves.

The system of slavery on a great scale grew out of the ascend-

ancy of capital. While the captives taken in war and the hereditary transmission of slavery sufficed to keep up the stock of slaves during the earlier period, this later system of slavery was, just like that of America, based on the methodically prosecuted hunting of man; for, owing to the manner in which slaves were used with little regard to their life or propagation, the slave population was constantly on the wane, and even the wars which were always furnishing new multitudes to the slave market were not sufficient to cover the deficit. No country where this species of game could be hunted remained exempt from visitation; even in Italy it was a thing by no means unheard of, that the poor freeman was placed by his employer among the slaves.¹⁴ But the negro-land of that period was western Asia, where the Cretan and Cilician corsairs, the real professional slave-hunters and slave-dealers, robbed the coasts of Syria and the Greek islands; and where, emulating their feats, the Roman revenue-farmers instituted human hunts in the client states and placed those whom they captured among their slaves. At the great slave market in Delos, where the slave-dealers of Asia Minor disposed of their wares to Italian speculators, on one day as many as 10,000 slaves are said to have been disembarked in the morning and to have been all sold before evening—a proof at once how enormous was the number of slaves delivered, and how, notwithstanding, the demand still exceeded the supply.

But far worse in every respect was the plantation-system proper—the cultivation of the fields by a band of slaves not unfrequently branded with iron, who with shackles on their legs performed the labors of the field under overseers during the day, and were locked up together by night in the common, frequently subterranean, laborers' prison. This plantation system had migrated from the East to Carthage and seems to have been brought by the Carthaginians to Sicily, where, probably for this reason, it appears developed earlier and more fully than in any other part of the Roman dominions.

¹⁴ Thus the slave was often of the same race as his master.

The abyss of misery and woe, which opens before our eyes, we leave to be fathomed by those who venture to gaze into such depths; it is very possible that, compared with the sufferings of the Roman slaves, the sum of all negro suffering is but a drop. Here we are not so much concerned with the hardships of the slaves themselves as with the perils which they brought upon the Roman state, and with the conduct of the government in confronting them.

Servile conspiracies and servile wars broke out everywhere. All at once the Romans were obliged to seize and execute in the capital 150, in Minturnae 450, in Sinuessa even 4000 slaves (133 B. C.). Still worse, as may be conceived, was the state of the provinces. At the great slave-market at Delos and in the Attic silver-mines, about the same period the revolted slaves had to be put down by force of arms. But worst of all, of course, was the condition of Sicily, the chosen land of the plantation system. The Romans found themselves compelled for three successive years (134–132 B. C.) to despatch consuls and consular armies to Sicily, till, after several undecided and even some unfavorable conflicts, the revolt was at length subdued.

Such was the external and internal condition of Rome, when the state entered on the seventh century of its existence. Wherever the eye turned, it encountered abuses and decay; the question could not but force itself on every sagacious and well-disposed man, whether this state of things were not capable of remedy.

ATTEMPTS AT REFORM

Cato

The party of reform first emerged, as it were, personified in Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 B. C.); he may be regarded as the representative of the opposition of the Roman middle class to the new nobility.

Throughout his long life he made it his task honestly, to the best of his judgment, to assail on all hands the prevailing customs; and even in his eighty-fifth year he battled in the Forum with the

new spirit of the times. He was anything but comely—he had green eyes, his enemies alleged, and red hair—and he was not a great man, still less a far-seeing statesman. Thoroughly narrow in his political and moral views, and having the ideal of the good old times always before his eyes and on his lips, he cherished an obstinate contempt for everything new.

The ruling lords, no doubt, looked down with a lofty disdain on the ignoble barker, and believed, not without reason, that they were far superior; but fashionable corruption in and out of the senate secretly trembled in the presence of the old censor of morals with his proud republican bearing, of the scar-covered veteran of the Hannibalic war, and of the highly influential senator who was the protector of the Roman farmers. He publicly laid before his noble colleagues, one after another, his list of their sins; certainly without being remarkably particular as to the proofs, and certainly also with a peculiar relish in the case of those who had personally crossed or provoked him. With equal fearlessness he reproved and publicly scolded the burgesses for every new injustice and every new disorder. His angry attacks provoked numerous enemies; he was publicly accused twenty-four times. But the farmers—and it is a significant indication how powerful still in the Roman middle class was the spirit which had enabled them to survive the day of Cannae—never allowed the unsparing champion of reform to lack the support of their votes.

Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus

Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus a youth without achievements had the boldness to give himself forth as the saviour of Italy. His mother Cornelia was the daughter of the conqueror of Zama; she herself was a highly cultivated and notable woman, who after the death of her much older husband, had refused the hand of the king of Egypt and reared her three surviving children in memory of her husband and her father. Tiberius, the elder of the two sons, was of a good and moral disposition, of gentle aspect and quiet

temper, apparently fitted for anything rather than for an agitator of the masses.

But when his intentions became known in wider circles, there was no want of approving voices, and many a public placard summoned the grandson of Africanus to think of the poor people and the deliverance of Italy.

Tiberius Gracchus was invested with the tribunate of the people on December 10, 134 B. C. Immediately after entering on office, he proposed the enactment of an agrarian law. Under it, all the state-lands which were occupied and enjoyed by the possessors without remuneration were to be resumed on behalf of the state. The domain-land thus resumed was to be broken up into lots of 30 *jugera* (or about twenty acres) and these were to be distributed partly to burgesses, partly to Italian allies, not as their own free property, but as inalienable heritable lease-holds, whose holders bound themselves to use the land for agriculture and to pay a moderate rent to the state.

War was thus declared against the great landholders; the measure appeared to be an ejection of the great landholders for the benefit of the agricultural proletariat; and in fact no statesman could give it any other name.¹⁵

Gaius Gracchus

Gaius Gracchus, brother of Tiberius, became a candidate for the tribuneship of the people, and was nominated to that office for the year 123 B. C. The democratic party, always poor in leaders of ability, had from sheer necessity remained virtually at rest for nine years; now the truce was at an end, and this time it was headed by a man who was in every respect called to take the lead.

The discipline of suffering which he had undergone, and his compulsory reserve during the last nine years, augmented his energy of purpose and action; the indignation repressed within

¹⁵ The law was passed, but by almost unconstitutional means. Tiberius was soon killed.

the depths of his breast only glowed there with an intensified fervor against the party which had disturbed his country and murdered his brother. By virtue of this fearful vehemence of temperament he became the foremost orator that Rome ever had; without it, we should probably have been able to reckon him among the first statesmen of all times.

Tiberius Gracchus had come before the burgesses with a single administrative reform. What Gaius introduced in a series of separate proposals was nothing else than an entirely new constitution; the foundation of which was furnished by the innovation previously introduced, that a tribune of the people should be at liberty to solicit re-election for the following year.

Gracchus earnestly labored to find a remedy for social evils, and to check the spread of pauperism; yet he at the same time intentionally reared up a street proletariat of the worst kind in the capital by his distributions of corn, which were designed to be, and became, a premium to all the lazy and hungry civic rabble.

When Gracchus had substantially completed the new constitution projected by him for the state, he applied himself to a second and difficult work. The question as to the Italian allies was still undecided. The democratic leaders naturally desired the utmost possible extension of the Roman franchise, not only in order to render the domains occupied by the Latins liable to distribution, but above all in order to reinforce their following by the enormous mass of new burgesses.

Towards the end of his second tribunate (122 B. C.) Gracchus accordingly made a proposal to grant to the Latins the full franchise, and to the other Italian allies the former rights of the Latins. But the proposal encountered the united opposition of the senate and the mob of the capital.

[The Roman citizens wishing in their pride to keep Roman citizenship for themselves alone, made the tragic mistake of opposing a measure which would have lessened the power of the senate and which would have strengthened the power of the people. During an uprising of the nobles against him Gaius Gracchus was killed.]

The whole nation was in a state of intellectual and moral decline, but especially the upper classes. The aristocracy before the period of the Gracchi was truly not over-rich in talent, and the benches of the senate were crowded by a pack of cowardly and dissolute nobles. There sat in it some respectable and able men, but never hitherto had the Roman aristocracy been so utterly deficient in men of statesmanly and military capacity.

[The history of Rome during the years following the death of Gaius Gracchus is such a jumble of events that we omit all details. The common people found a leader in the plow-boy general Marius, who could sway the army. He was elected consul seven times. Then the senate took for their leader Sulla, another general. Wars against the northern barbarians, wars in Spain, in Africa against Jugurtha, in Asia Minor against Mithridates, and a war between the Italian allies and Rome, gave the rivals, Marius and Sulla, opportunities to win military glory. But conditions in Rome grew worse. After the death of Marius and Sulla, Pompey was hailed as leader by the people. But Pompey who was a great general but not a statesman, soon tried to be on both sides, that of the people and that of the senate, and naturally he, too, failed. The conditions in Rome at this time are well shown in *A Friend of Caesar* by William Stearns Davis. Many pupils will enjoy the novel. The conspiracy of Catiline may be given as a special topic. Catiline, defeated in an election for consul, conspired to seize the government. The orations against Catiline, by the great orator Cicero, are among Cicero's most famous works. The early life and conquests of Caesar may also be given as a special topic. We begin with his decision to cross the Rubicon. As governor of Gaul on both sides of the Alps, Caesar had command of the army there; but when he led his soldiers across the brook, the Rubicon, which separated Gaul from Italy, he risked not only his life but his honor: he risked being called a traitor, in order to save Rome from herself. The following extracts from Mommsen's famous panegyric on Caesar are probably too difficult for the average pupil to read without help from the teacher.]

Julius Caesar

When Caesar was informed as to the reception which his proposals had met with in the capital, he called together the soldiers of the thirteenth legion, and unfolded before them the state of things. It was not merely the man of genius versed in the knowledge and skilled in the control of men's hearts, whose brilliant eloquence shone forth and glowed in this agitating crisis of his own and the world's destiny; not merely the generous commander-in-

chief and the victorious general addressing soldiers who had been called by himself to arms and for eight years had followed his banners with daily increasing enthusiasm. There spoke, above all, the energetic and consistent statesman, who had now for nine and twenty years defended the cause of freedom in good and evil times; who had braved for it the daggers of assassins and the executioners of the aristocracy, the swords of the Germans and the waves of the unknown ocean, without ever yielding or wavering; who had torn to pieces the Sullan constitution, had overthrown the rule of the senate, and had furnished the defenceless and unarmed democracy with protection and with arms by means of the struggle beyond the Alps. And he spoke to the young men from the towns and villages of northern Italy, who still felt freshly and purely the mighty influence of the thought of civic freedom; who were still capable of fighting and of dying for ideals. And when he—the leader and general of the popular party—summoned the soldiers of the people, now that conciliatory means had been exhausted and concession had reached its utmost limits, to follow him in the last, the inevitable, the decisive struggle against the equally hated and despised, equally perfidious and incapable, and in fact ludicrously incorrigible aristocracy—there was not an officer or a soldier who could hold back. The order was given for departure; at the head of his vanguard Caesar crossed the narrow brook which separated his province from Italy, and which the constitution forbade the proconsul of Gaul to pass. When after nine years' absence he trod once more the soil of his native land, he trod at the same time the path of revolution. "The die was cast." . . .

The new monarch of Rome, the first ruler of the whole domain of Romano-Hellenic civilization, Gaius Julius Caesar, was in his fifty-sixth year (born 12th July 102 B. C.?) when the battle of Thapsus,¹⁶ the last link in a long chain of momentous victories,

¹⁶ in northern Africa where Caesar totally defeated Pompey in 46 B. C. For an account of Caesar's last campaigns and final victory, see Mommsen Bk. V, Chapters 10 and 11.

placed the decision of the future of the world in his hands. Few men have had their elasticity so thoroughly put to the proof as Caesar—the sole creative genius produced by Rome, and the last produced by the ancient world, which accordingly moved on in the track that he marked out for it until its sun had set. Sprung from one of the oldest noble families of Latium—which traced back its lineage to the heroes of the Iliad and the kings of Rome, he had tasted the sweetness as well as the bitterness of the cup of fashionable life. But the flexible steel of that nature was proof against even these dissipated and flighty courses; Caesar retained both his bodily vigor and his elasticity of mind and heart unimpaired. In fencing and in riding he was a match for any of his soldiers, and at Alexandria his swimming saved his life; the incredible rapidity of his journeys, which usually for the sake of gaining time were performed by night, was the astonishment of his contemporaries and not the least among the causes of his success. The mind was like the body. His memory was matchless, and it was easy for him to carry on several occupations simultaneously with equal self-possession.

Caesar was thoroughly a realist and a man of sense; and whatever he undertook and achieved was pervaded and guided by the cool sobriety which constitutes the most marked peculiarity of his genius. To this he owed the power of living energetically in the present, undisturbed either by recollection or by expectation; to this he owed the capacity of acting at any moment with collected vigor, and applying his whole genius even to the smallest and most incidental enterprise; to this he owed the many-sided power with which he grasped and mastered whatever understanding can comprehend and will can compel; to this he owed the “marvellous serenity” which remained steadily with him through good and evil days.

Gifts such as these could not fail to produce a statesman. From early youth, accordingly, Caesar was a statesman in the deepest sense of the term, and his aim was the highest which man is allowed to propose to himself—the political, military, intel-

lectual, and moral regeneration of his own deeply decayed nation, and of the still more deeply decayed Hellenic nation intimately akin to his own.

If the old, in every respect vicious, state of things was to be successfully got rid of and the commonwealth was to be renovated it was necessary first of all that the country should be practically tranquillized and that the ground should be cleared from the rubbish with which since the recent catastrophe it was everywhere strewed.

First of all therefore all the older quarrels of the republican past were regarded as done away for ever and irrevocably. While Caesar gave orders that the statues of Sulla which had been thrown down by the mob of the capital on the news of the battle of Pharsalus¹⁷ should be re-erected, and thus recognized the fact that it became history alone to sit in judgment on that great man, he at the same time cancelled the last remaining effects of Sulla's exceptional laws, recalled from exile those who had been banished, and restored to the children of those outlawed by Sulla their forfeited privilege of eligibility to office.

Far more difficult than the settlement of these questions¹²¹ which already belonged substantially to the past, was the treatment of the parties confronting each other at the moment—on the one hand Caesar's own democratic adherents, on the other hand the overthrown aristocracy. That the former should be, if possible, still less satisfied than the latter with Caesar's conduct after the victory and with his summons to abandon the old standing-ground of party, was to be expected. Caesar himself desired doubtless on the whole the same issue which Gaius Gracchus had contemplated; but the designs of the Caesarians were no longer those of the Gracchans. The Roman popular party had been driven onward in gradual progression from reform to revolution, from revolution to anarchy, from anarchy to a war against property; they celebrated among themselves the memory of the reign of terror and now adorned the tomb of Catiline, as formerly that

¹⁷ where, in Greece, Caesar had defeated Pompey in 48 B.C.

of the Gracchi, with flowers and garlands. Against a rabble of this sort, who are not intent on any political question at all, but solely on a war against property, the mere existence of a strong government is sufficient; and Caesar was too great and too considerate to busy himself with the apprehensions which the Italian Harmists felt regarding the communists of that day.

Among minor measures, Caesar, even from a natural sense of propriety, avoided exasperating the fallen party by empty sarcasm; he did not triumph over his conquered fellow-burgesses; he mentioned Pompeius often and always with respect, and caused his statue overthrown by the people to be re-erected at the senate-house in its earlier distinguished place. To political prosecutions after the victory Caesar assigned the narrowest possible limits. Further, all the common soldiers who had followed their Roman or provincial officers into the contest against Caesar came off with impunity.

Risings of pretenders as well as of republicans were incessantly brewing throughout the Roman empire; the flames of civil war kindled now by the Pompeians, now by the republicans, again burst forth brightly at various places; and in the capital there was perpetual conspiracy against the life of the monarch. But Caesar could not be induced by these plots even to surround himself permanently with a body-guard, and usually contented himself with making known the detected conspiracies by public placards.

Caesar's monarchy was not the Oriental despotism of divine right, but a monarchy such as Gaius Gracchus wished to found, such as Pericles and Cromwell founded—the representation of the nation by the man in whom it puts supreme and unlimited confidence. The new name of Imperator appears in every respect the appropriate formal expression for the new monarchy. From ancient times there stood on the Capitol the statues of those seven kings, whom the conventional history of Rome was wont to bring on the stage. Caesar ordered his own erected beside them as the eighth. He appeared publicly in the costume of the old kings of Alba—not in the robe of the consuls which was bordered with purple stripes,

but in the robe wholly of purple which was reckoned in antiquity as the proper regal attire, and received, sitting on his golden chair and without rising from it, the solemn procession of the senate. He fully and definitely reverted to the tradition of the regal period; the burgess-assembly remained—what it had already been in that period—by the side of and with the king the supreme and ultimate expression of the will of the sovereign people; the senate was brought back to its original destination of giving advice to the ruler when he requested it; and lastly the ruler concentrated in his person anew the whole magisterial authority, so that there existed no independent state official by his side any more than by the side of the kings of the earliest times. The rule of the nobility was thus set aside.

Partly at earlier periods, partly during the recent civil war, Caesar had worked at the tranquillizing of Spain, and had established strong positions for the defence of the frontier in Africa along the great desert, and in the northwest of the empire along the line of the Rhine. He occupied himself with similar plans for the countries on the Euphrates and on the Danube. But there is no evidence at all that Caesar contemplated like Alexander an indefinite career of victory. It is in a high degree probable that Caesar with Scipio Aemilianus¹⁸ called on the gods not to increase the empire, but to preserve it.

The general result of the financial administration of Caesar is expressed in the fact that, while by sagacious and energetic reforms and by a right combination of economy and liberality he amply and fully met all equitable claims, nevertheless in March 44 B. C. there lay in the public treasury 700,000,000, and in his own 100,000,000 sesterces (together £8,000,000)—a sum which exceeded by tenfold the amount of cash in the treasury in the most flourishing times of the republic.

But the task of breaking up the old parties and furnishing the new commonwealth with an appropriate constitution, an efficient

¹⁸ adopted grandson of Scipio Africanus, and leader of the nobles 132 B.C.

army, and well-ordered finances, difficult as it was, was not the most difficult part of Caesar's work. If the Italian nation was really to be regenerated, it required a reorganization which should transform all parts of the great empire—Rome, Italy, and the provinces—to the very foundation. Let us endeavor here also to delineate the old state of things, as well as the beginnings of a new and more tolerable time.

From the whole compass of the widespread empire people flocked to Rome, for speculation, for debauchery, for intrigue, for accomplishment in crime, or even for the purpose of hiding there from the eye of the law. Nowhere were such masses of slaves accumulated as in the city palaces of the great families or of wealthy upstarts. Nowhere were the nations of the three continents mingled as in the slave population of the capital. The popular festivals had been allowed so to increase that the seven ordinary ones, alone, lasted altogether sixty-two days; and to these were added the gladiatorial games and numerous other extraordinary amusements. Nowhere was a man less secure of his life than in the capital; murder professionally prosecuted by banditti was the single trade peculiar to it; the alluring of the victim to Rome was the preliminary to his assassination; no one ventured into the country in the vicinity of the capital without an armed retinue. The streets ascended and descended narrow and angular, and were wretchedly kept; the footpaths were small and ill paved. The ordinary houses were built of bricks negligently and to a giddy height. Like isolated islands amidst this sea of wretched buildings were seen the splendid palaces of the rich, beside whose marble pillars and Greek statues the decaying temples, with their images of the gods still in great part carved of wood, made a melancholy figure. A police-supervision of streets, of riverbanks, of fires, or of building was almost unheard of; if the government troubled itself at all about the inundations, conflagrations, and falls of houses which were of yearly occurrence, it was only to ask from the state-theologians their report and advice regarding the true import of such signs and wonders.

Caesar worked energetically at the improvement of the lamentable and disgraceful state of things prevailing there. Caesar could not abolish slavery with its train of national calamities. As little could Caesar conjure into existence a free industry in the capital; yet the great building-operations remedied in some measure the want of means of support there, and opened up to the proletariat a source of small but honorable gain. Measures were further taken to set bounds to the serious fluctuations in the price of the most important means of subsistence in the markets of the capital. The detailed regulations, which Caesar issued regarding the police of the capital, are in great part still preserved; and all who choose may convince themselves that the Emperor did not disdain to insist on the house proprietors putting the streets into repair and paving the footpath in its whole breadth with hewn stones, and to issue appropriate enactments regarding the carrying of litters and the driving of wagons, which from the nature of the streets were only allowed to move freely through the capital in the evening and by night.

While in the capital the only object aimed at was to get rid of palpable evils by police ordinances on the greatest scale, it was a far more difficult task to remedy the deep disorganization of Italian society. Where the old Latin and Italian farmers had sown and reaped—there now rose in barren splendor the villas of the Roman nobles, some of which covered the space of a moderate-sized town with their appurtenances of garden-grounds and aqueducts, fresh and salt water ponds for the preservation and breeding of fishes, game-preserves for keeping hares, rabbits, stags, roes, and wild boars, and aviaries in which even cranes and peacocks were kept. In consequence of this economic system there arose a most fearful disproportion in the distribution of wealth. The often used and often abused phrase of a commonwealth composed of millionaires and beggars applies perhaps nowhere so completely as to the Rome of the last age of the republic. It is a dreadful picture—this picture of Italy under the rule of the oligarchy. It is a terrible picture, but not one peculiar to Italy; wherever the govern-

ment of capitalists in a slave-state has fully developed itself, it has desolated God's fair world in the same way. Caesar applied all his energies to bring back the nation to its home and family life, and to reform the national economy by law and decree.

The provinces, which Caesar found in existence, were fourteen in number. In the administration of these provinces oligarchic misrule reached a point which no second government has ever attained at least in the West. The wounds inflicted had to be healed by time; Caesar took care that they might be so healed, and that there should be no fresh inflictions. The system of administration was thoroughly remodelled. The Sullan proconsuls and *propraetors* had been in their provinces essentially sovereign and practically subject to no control; those of Caesar were the well-disciplined servants of a stern master, who from the very unity and life-tenure¹⁹ of his power sustained a more natural and more tolerable relation to the subjects than those numerous, annually changing, petty tyrants. But this abolition of existing abuses was not the main matter in Caesar's provincial reform. Italy was converted from the mistress of the subject peoples into the mother of the renovated Italo-Hellenic nation. On the threshold of full national and political equalization with Italy stood the adjoining lands, the Greek Sicily and the south of Gaul, which was rapidly becoming Latinized. In a more remote stage of preparation stood the other provinces of the empire. Thus the new united empire was furnished with a national character.

The outlines have thus been set forth,²⁰ which Caesar drew for this work, according to which he labored himself, and according to which posterity endeavored to prosecute the work, if not with the intellect and energy, yet on the whole in accordance with the intentions, of the illustrious master. Little was finished; much was merely begun. Caesar ruled as king of Rome for five years and a half, not half as long as Alexander; in the intervals of seven great campaigns, which allowed him to stay not more than fifteen

¹⁹ He had been made dictator for life.

²⁰ See Mommsen Book V, Chapter 11 in full.

months altogether in the capital of his empire, he regulated the destinies of the world for the present and the future, from the establishment of the boundary-line between civilization and barbarism down to the removal of the rain-pools in the streets of the capital, and yet retained time and composure enough attentively to follow the prize-pieces in the theatre and to confer the chaplet on the victor with improvised verses. Thus he worked and created as never any mortal did before or after him; and as a worker and creator he still, after well-nigh two thousand years, lives in the memory of the nations—the first, and the unique, Imperator Caesar.

We have reached the end of the Roman republic. We have seen it rule for five hundred years in Italy and in the countries on the Mediterranean; we have seen it brought to ruin in politics and morals, religion and literature, not through outward violence but through inward decay, and thereby making room for the new monarchy of Caesar.

When at length after a long historical night a new day dawned once more for the peoples, and fresh nations in free self-movement commenced their race towards new and higher goals, there were found among them not a few, in which the seed sown by Caesar had sprung up, and which were and are indebted to him for their national individuality.

[Mommson thus ends his *History of Rome*. The period of the empire is covered very fully by Merivale in his *Romans under the Empire*, and by Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. However, we can only glance at its history during the next five hundred years. Caesar's assassination and funeral may be given in special topics. Merivale gives full details. Parts of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* may perhaps be acted by pupils. We quote a brief summary of the next years as given by the learned Edward Freeman, D.C.L. in his *A General Sketch of European History*.]

THE EMPIRE

After the death of Julius Caesar, there followed a time of great confusion, lasting for thirteen years. Brutus and Cassius,

who had killed Caesar, stood up for the commonwealth, and there was a war between them and Marcus Antonius, one of Caesar's officers, and Caesar's great-nephew Octavius, whom Caesar had adopted. These two, along with Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, formed what was called a Triumvirate for settling the affairs of the commonwealth. Meanwhile Brutus and Cassius, like Pompeius, had gone to the East, and in 42 B.C. was fought the battle of Philippi in Macedonia between them and the Triumvirs, in which the hopes of the party of the commonwealth were crushed. Presently Antonius professed to make war upon the Parthians, but he did nothing great, for he was utterly bewitched by Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, the last of the dynasty of the Ptolemies. War presently followed between Octavius Caesar and Antonius, and Antonius and Cleopatra were altogether defeated in a sea-fight at Action on the west coast of Greece. Antonius and Cleopatra presently killed themselves, and Egypt became a Roman province.

The Senate and the People gradually voted Octavius Caesar one honor and office after another. The new title of Augustus²¹ was voted to him; and all who succeeded him called themselves Caesar and Augustus. This is the beginning of the Roman *Empire* for, of the various titles born by Augustus and his successors, that of Emperor (*Imperator*) or chief of the army was the one that prevailed in the end. The reign of Augustus lasted forty-one years (27 B. C.—14 A. D.). During that time he was practically master of Rome and of the whole Empire. He, however, never took on himself anything of the pomp of royalty, but behaved simply. He did not seek to make any great conquests. His reign is also famous as the time when many of the best-known Latin writers lived.²²

²¹ "The epithet Augustus had never been borne by any man before; it had been applied to things most noble, most venerable, and most divine. The rites of the gods were called *august*, the temples were *august*; the word itself was derived from the holy *auguries* by which the divine will was revealed; it was connected with the favor and *authority* of Jove himself." Merivale. His reign was so successful that "an Augustan period" has come to mean a great period.

²² Special topics on: Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and the historian Livy.

Tiberius, the step-son of Augustus, whom he had adopted, succeeded him. The Empire was on the whole prosperous in his time; but he did many jealous and cruel things, causing the death of all of whom he was in any way afraid.

His grand-nephew Caius, common called Caligula, succeeded him, and reigned four years. He seems to have been quite mad, and did the wildest and wickedest things in every way, and at last he was killed by some of his officers.

The soldiers then chose Claudius, uncle of Caius, and the senate had to confirm their choice. This was the first time that an emperor was chosen by the army. It was in his time that the Roman conquest of Britain began; Claudius himself went to Britain in 43 A. D.

Nero, the step-son of Claudius succeeded him and reigned well for a while, but gradually became the worst of the whole family for every form of vice and cruelty. At last the soldiers in the distant provinces began to rebel, and Nero was deposed by a vote of the Senate, and died by his own hand in 68.²³

The greatest of all the fires which desolated Rome was that which broke out on the 19th of July, in the year 64 A. D., the tenth of Nero's reign. Amidst the horror and confusion of the scene, the smoke, the blaze, the din, and the scorching heat, with half the population, bond and free, cast loose and houseless into the streets, ruffians were seen to thrust blazing brands into the buildings, who affirmed, when seized by the indignant sufferers, that they were acting with orders; and the crime, which was probably the desperate resource of slaves and robbers, was imputed by fierce suspicions to the government itself. The people continued to mutter their dissatisfaction with increasing significance; it was necessary to divert their suspicions by offering them another victim; and Nero seems to have saved himself at last by sacrificing the little band, already the objects of their hatred and reviling to whom the people gave the name of Christians. 'This

²³ What follows is quoted from Merivale's *The Romans under the Empire*.

name' says Tacitus in a famous passage in his *Annals*, 'was derived from one Christus, who was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator of Judea, Pontius Pilate. . . . Those only were first arrested who avowed themselves of that sect; afterwards a vast number. . . . not so much on the charge of burning, as for their general hatred to mankind. Their execution was accompanied with mockery. They were wrapped in skins to be torn in pieces by dogs, or crucified, and thus set on fire to serve as torches by night. Nero lent his own gardens for the spectacle, and gave a chariot race on the occasion, at which he mingled freely with the multitude in the garb of a driver or actually holding the reins. The populace, however, turned with their usual levity to compassion for the sufferers, for they felt that it was not for their actual guilt nor the common weal that they were punished, but to glut the ferocity of a single tyrant.'²⁴

[Nero was followed by Galba, (68-69), Otho, (69), Vitellius (69), and Vespasian, (69-79).]

Vespasian, though averse to shedding the blood of gladiators, exhibited combats of men with beasts. The accession of the Flavian²⁵ dynasty was signalized by the erection of the most magnificent of the Roman amphitheatres. The Colosseum far exceeds in its dimensions any similar structure of the ancient world; but from the specimens we possess of the Roman amphitheatre, we may conclude that it deviated little in construction from the approved models of the age. Eighty-seven thousand spectators were accommodated within the walls. The building was of the rich and warm travertine stone, or encrusted with marble; the most conspicuous parts shone with precious gems and metals; a gilded network protected the sitters in the lowest rows from the chance assaults of the animals beneath them, and the precaution was taken of making the topmost bar to turn on a swivel, so as to

²⁴ Some pupils may care to read *Quo Vadis* by Henryk Sienkiewicz, which gives a very vivid picture of the times of Nero.

²⁵ Vespasian and his sons Titus and Domitian belonged to the house of Flavius.

revolve at a slight touch, and baffle any attempt to climb by it. It was the work of several years, nor was it completed and consecrated till after the death of its founder.

Vespasian, with admirable prudence, had admitted his son Titus (79–81 A. D.) the darling of the army of Judea, to a share of the imperial power. Titus was beloved by the Romans, and those the Romans loved ever died young. Fate indeed did not always require that they should suffer; but the career of Titus was not only brief, but clouded in its latter years by a series of public disasters. The city was visited in the first place, by a terrible conflagration, which raged unchecked for three days, and was second in extent to that, hardly yet repaired, of Nero. The Capitol itself fell once more a prey to the flames. Again Rome suffered from a pestilence, in which, if we may credit the statement of a late authority, ten thousand persons perished daily for some time. The great eruption of Vesuvius, which overwhelmed the cities of Campania, was perhaps more alarming, though the loss it inflicted might be much less considerable.

The account we have received is valuable for the study of Roman character, as well as for its own intrinsic interest. The writer is the younger Pliny, the nephew of the great naturalist, who describes it in two well known letters.²⁶ The elder Pliny, the friend and devoted servant of Vespasian and Titus, at this time commanded the imperial fleet at Misenum, and divided his time with marvelous assiduity between the discharge of official duties, and the accumulation of extraordinary stores of knowledge. On the 24th of August in the year 79, Pliny was residing in his villa in the Misenian promontory, which lies about twenty miles in a direct line from the summit of Vesuvius, conspicuous across the gulf of Naples. His attention was drawn from his books and writings to a cloud of unusual form and character, which hung over the mountain, and rose, as appeared on further examination, from it, spreading out from a slender and well-defined stem, like

²⁶ written to Tacitus.

the figure of a pinetree. Its colour changed rapidly from black to white, as the contents of the ejected mass of which it proved to be composed, were earth or ashes. The admiral ordered his Liburnian cutter to be manned, and casting aside his papers prepared to cross the water, and observe the phenomenon nearer. He asked his nephew to accompany him, but the younger student was too intent on the volumes before him to prosecute an inquiry into the operations of nature. Meanwhile, intelligence arrived from the terrified residents at the foot of the mountain. They implored the powerful assistance of the commander of the fleet. Pliny directed his largest vessels to be got ready, and steered to the point nearest to the danger. As he approached the shore the ashes began to fall thick and hot upon his deck, with showers of glowing stones. A shoal formed suddenly beneath his keel, and impeded his progress. Turning a little to the right he came to land at Stabiae, at the dwelling of a friend. Here he restored confidence to the affrighted occupants by the calmness of his demeanor, while he insisted on taking the usual refreshment of the bath and supper, and conversed with easy hilarity. As the shades of evening gathered, the brightness of the flames became more striking; but to calm the panic of those around him, the philosopher assured them that they arose from cottages on the slope, which the alarmed rustics had abandoned to the descending flakes of fire. He then took his customary brief night's rest, sleeping composedly as usual; but his attendants were not so easily tranquillized, and as the night advanced, the continued fall of ashes within the courts of the mansion convinced them that delay would make escape impossible. They roused their master, together with the friend at whose house he was resting, and hastily debated how to proceed. By this time the soil around them was rocking with repeated shocks of earthquake, which recalled the horrors of the still recent catastrophe. The party quitted the treacherous shelter of the house-roof, and sought the coast in hopes of finding vessels to take them off. To protect themselves from the thickening cinders they tied cushions to their heads. The sky was darkened by the ceaseless shower,

and they groped their way by torchlight, and by the intermitting flashes from the mountain. The sea was agitated, and abandoned by every bark. Pliny, wearied or perplexed, now stretched himself on a piece of sail-cloth, and refused to stir farther, while on the bursting forth of a fiercer blast accompanied with sulphureous gases, his companions, all but two body-slaves, fled in terror. Some who looked back in their flight affirmed that the old man rose once with the help of his attendants, but immediately fell again, overpowered, as it seemed with the deadly vapors. When the storm abated and light at last returned, the body was found abandoned on the spot; neither the skin nor the clothes were injured, and the calm expression of the countenance betokened death by suffocation.

Such is the account the younger Pliny, who was but eighteen, gives of his uncle's death from hearsay. In another letter he relates the circumstances which he himself witnessed from his safer post at Misenum. The projected volume of solid matter, such as sand and ashes in a state of ignition, consumed all the habitations of man on which it lighted, or if its heat was a little abated by distance, engulfed them under a ponderous mass of dust and cinders. The shower was wafted perhaps in various directions by the shifting breezes; Herculaneum to the southwest, and Pompeii to the southeast of the mountain were completely overwhelmed by it, while other spots between them and around them escaped almost scatheless. The eruption seems to have been preceded by some premonitory shocks, and it is evident that these towns were in a great measure abandoned at the moment of the catastrophe."²⁷

[Titus was followed by the tyrant Domitian (81-96 A. D.) Then followed the "Five good emperors"—Nerva (96-98), Trajan (98-117), Hadrian (117-138), and the Antonines—Aurelius Antoninus called the Pius (138-161), adopted son of Hadrian, and his adopted son Marcus Aurelius (161-180).²⁸

The next twenty-eight emperors who ruled during the years between 180 A. D. and 284 A. D. are often spoken of as the "Barrack-room Emperors" because they were most of them put into office by the army. With scarcely an exception they are not worthy of mention.

²⁷ Special topic: Modern excavations at Pompeii.

²⁸ Special topic: The writings and character of Marcus Aurelius.

Diocletian (284–305) associated with himself (286 A. D.) a co-ruler, Maximian; he decided that the Roman empire had become so large that it could be governed better if divided into two parts. To each co-ruler was given an assistant or Caesar. The empire was thus divided into four parts. Diocletian made his court, which was at Milan, an example of despotic grandeur, and of oriental pomp. Special topics may be given on his persecution of the Christians and on his character and government.

Constantius and Galerius ruled from 305 to 311. We shall speak later of the church council of 311.

Licinius and Constantine I (son of Constantius) ruled from 311 to 324 A. D. Then having conquered Licinius and exiled him, Constantine ruled alone (324–337). He chose the ancient city of Byzantium on the Bosphorus as his capital, changing its name to Constantine's City (*polis* is Greek for city) or Constantinople. The most important act of his life was probably the edict giving Christians freedom to worship as they pleased. This we shall take up later under the history of Christianity.

We need not follow the rulers of the Roman empire further. In 364 A. D. the division of the empire begun by Diocletian was completed by Valentinian I ruling as emperor of the Western empire, and Valens as ruler of the Eastern empire with its capital at Constantinople. From 374 A. D. to 476 A. D., when Rome fell, fourteen other emperors ruled in the Western Roman empire at Milan, and six ruled in the Eastern Roman empire at Constantinople. We turn now to look at the northern races which were soon to rule the world.]

THE INVASIONS OF ROME BY THE GOTHs

In the disastrous period of the fall of the Roman empire, which may justly be dated from the reign of Valens (364–A. D. 378) the arts and labors of ages were rudely defaced by the barbarians of Scythia and Germany.²⁹

²⁹ We quote from Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and take from his text this note. The Huns, who under the reign of Valens threatened the empire of Rome, had been formidable, in a much earlier period, to the empire of China. Their ancient, perhaps their original, seat was an extensive though dry and barren tract of country immediately on the north side of the great wall. In the third century before the Christian era, a wall fifteen hundred miles in length was constructed to defend the frontiers of China against the inroads of the Huns.

The course of their emigration had carried them beyond the limits of Chinese geography; but we are able to distinguish the two great divisions of these people, which directed their march towards the Oxus and towards the Volga. The first of these colonies established their dominion in the fruitful and extensive plains on the eastern side of the Caspian, where they preserved the name of Huns. The second division gradually advanced towards the north-west.

From the military officers who were intrusted with the defence of the Danube, Valens learned that the North was agitated by a furious tempest; that the irruption of the Huns, an unknown and monstrous race of savages, had subverted the power of the Goths;³⁰ and that the suppliant multitudes of that warlike nation, whose pride was now humbled in the dust, covered a space of many miles along the banks of the river. With outstretched arms and pathetic lamentations they loudly deplored their past misfortunes and their present danger; acknowledged that their only hope of safety was in the clemency of the Roman government; and most solemnly protested that, if the gracious liberality of the emperor would permit them to cultivate the waste lands of Thrace, they should ever hold themselves bound, by the strongest obligations of duty and gratitude, to obey the laws and to guard the limits of the empire. These assurances were confirmed by the

It is impossible to fill the dark interval of time which elapsed after the Huns of the Volga were lost in the eyes of the Chinese, and before they showed themselves to those of the Romans. There is some reason, however, to apprehend that the same force which had driven them from their native seats still continued to impel their march towards the frontiers of Europe.

The great Hermanric, a Goth, whose dominions extended from the Baltic to the Euxine, enjoyed, in the full maturity of age and reputation, the fruit of his victories, when he was alarmed by the formidable approach of a host of unknown enemies, on whom his barbarous subjects might without injustice bestow the epithet of barbarians. The numbers, the strength, the rapid motions, and the implacable cruelty of the Huns were felt, and dreaded, and magnified by the astonished Goths, who beheld their fields and villages consumed with flames and deluged with indiscriminate slaughter. To these real terrors they added the surprise and abhorrence which were excited by the shrill voice, the uncouth gestures, and the strange deformity of the Huns.

³⁰ We come for the first time to a Teutonic people. The Goths—Ostrogoths, or East Goths (compare Oester or Easter) and the Visigoths or West Goths—were among the largest tribes of the Teutonic peoples. Other tribes were the Germani, Alemanni, (compare the French word for Germans, *Alemans*) Franks, Jutes, Angles, Saxons, Danes, Suevi, Vandals, and Lombards. The words Germanic, Gothic, and Teutonic are often used interchangeably. The modern descendants of the early Teutonic peoples are, broadly speaking, the Scandinavians, Germans, English, Danes and Dutch.

Special topics should be given on: Runic inscriptions; Teutonic characteristics; Teutonic government; Teutonic gods (Woden, or Odin, Thor, etc. Compare our days of the week); Ulfilas or Wulfila; the Ulfilas Bible in Upsala; Icelandic and Norse and German sagas, legends, and epic literature.

ambassadors of the Goths, who impatiently expected from the mouth of Valens an answer that must finally determine the fate of their unhappy countrymen.

The prayers of the Goths were granted, and their service was accepted by the Imperial court; and orders were immediately despatched to the civil and military governors of the Thracian diocese [division of a Roman province] to make the necessary preparations for the passage and subsistence of a great people, till sufficient territory could be allotted for their future residence.

The whole mass of people who composed this formidable emigration must have amounted to nearly a million persons. Such an undisciplined and unsettled nation of barbarians required the firmest temper and the most dexterous management. The insolence or the indignation of the Goths, if they conceived themselves to be the objects either of fear or of contempt, might urge them to the most desperate extremities, and the fortune of the state seemed to depend on the prudence, as well as the integrity, of the generals of Valens. At this important crisis the military government of Thrace was exercised by men, who instead of obeying the orders of their sovereign, and satisfying with decent liberality, the demands of the Goths, levied an ungenerous and oppressive tax on the wants of the hungry barbarians. The vilest food was sold at an extravagant price, and, in the place of wholesome and substantial provisions, the markets were filled with the flesh of dogs and of unclean animals who had died of disease. To obtain a pound of bread the Goths paid a serviceable slave, and a small quantity of meat was greedily purchased with ten pounds of a precious metal.

[The Goths naturally revolted, and in a battle near Adrianople 378 A. D. defeated Valens, who was killed. Theodosius, the next emperor of the Eastern Roman Empire, overcame the Goths, but allowed them to settle in Thrace and let them enlist, in large numbers, in the Roman legions. After Theodosius, Arcadius ruled in the Eastern empire, and the weak Honorius—only eleven years old at his accession—in the West.]

Alaric the Goth

Alaric resolved to seek a plentiful harvest of fame and riches in a province which had hitherto escaped the ravages of war. He had traversed, without resistance, the plains of Macedonia and Thessaly. The troops which had been posted to defend the pass of Thermopylae retired without attempting to disturb the secure and rapid passage of Alaric; and the fertile fields of Phocis and Boeotia were instantly covered by a deluge of barbarians. Thebes was less indebted for her preservation to the strength of her seven gates than to the eager haste of Alaric who advanced to occupy the city of Athens, and the important harbor of the Piraeus.

The hope of the Roman people was placed in the powerful assistance of the general of the West, Stilicho, who advanced to chastise the invaders of Greece. A fleet was equipped in the ports of Italy; and the troops were soon safely disembarked on the isthmus, near the ruins of Corinth. The skill and perseverance of the Roman at length prevailed, and the Goths retreated. The camp of the barbarians was immediately besieged, the waters of the river were diverted into another channel; and while they labored under the intolerable pressure of thirst and hunger, a strong line of defences was formed to prevent their escape. After these precautions Stilicho, too confident of victory, retired to enjoy his triumph in the theatrical games and dances of the Greeks.

The operations of Alaric must have been secret, prudent, and rapid, since the Roman general was confounded by the intelligence that the Goths, who had eluded his efforts, were in full possession of the important province of Epirus. This unfortunate delay on the part of Stilicho allowed Alaric sufficient time to conclude the treaty which he secretly negotiated with the ministers of Constantinople; and an edict was published at Constantinople which declared the promotion of Alaric to the rank of master-general of the Eastern Illyricum. With the unanimous consent of the barbarian chieftains, Alaric was elevated according to ancient custom, on a shield, and solemnly proclaimed king of the Visigoths. Armed with this double power, seated on the verge of the two empires, he

alternately sold his deceitful promises to the courts of Arcadius and Honorius, till he declared and executed his resolution of invading the dominions of the West. He was tempted by the fame, the beauty, the wealth of Italy, which he had twice visited; and he secretly aspired to plant the Gothic standard on the walls of Rome, and to enrich his army with the accumulated spoils of three hundred triumphs.

The emperor Honorius was distinguished by the pre-eminence of fear as well as of rank. The arts of flattery concealed the impending danger till Alaric approached the palace of Milan. But when the sound of war had awakened the young emperor, instead of flying to arms with the spirit, or even the rashness of his age, he eagerly listened to those timid counsellors who proposed to convey his sacred person and his faithful attendants to some secure and distant station. As Alaric approached the walls or rather the suburbs of Milan, he enjoyed the proud satisfaction of seeing the emperor of the Romans fly before him. Honorius, accompanied by a feeble train of statesmen, hastily retreated towards the Alps.

[How Stilicho came to his rescue and how the Goths were temporarily driven back is an interesting subject for a special topic.]

The recent danger to which the person of the emperor Honorius had been exposed in the defenceless palace of Milan urged him to seek a retreat in some inaccessible fortress of Italy, where he might securely remain, while the open country was covered by a deluge of barbarians. On the coast of the Adriatic, about ten or twelve miles from the most southern of the seven mouths of the Po was the ancient colony of Ravenna. A thousand canals divided the city into a variety of small islands; communication was maintained by the use of boats and bridges; the houses of Ravenna, whose appearance may be compared to that of Venice, were raised on the foundation of wooden piles. The adjacent country, to the distance of many miles, was a deep and impassable morass; and the artificial causeway which connected Ravenna with the continent might be easily guarded or destroyed on the approach of a hostile army.

This advantageous situation was fortified by art and labor; and in the twentieth year of his age the emperor of the West, anxious only for his personal safety, retired to the walls and morasses of Ravenna. The example of Honorius was imitated by his feeble successors, the Gothic kings, and till the middle of the eighth century Ravenna was considered as the seat of government and capital of Italy.

While the emperor and his court enjoyed with sullen pride the security of the marshes and fortifications of Ravenna, they abandoned Rome almost without defence to the resentment of Alaric.

[Honorius, apparently jealous of the fame of Stilicho, now had him murdered. Alaric twice laid siege to Rome. Twice he fixed a ransom, but Honorius rejected Alaric's offers of peace. Then Alaric entered Rome and sacked it in 410 A. D.]

The king of the Goths who no longer dissembled his appetite for plunder and revenge, appeared in arms under the walls of the capital; and the trembling senate, without any hopes of relief, prepared by a desperate resistance to delay the ruin of their country. But they were unable to guard against the secret conspiracy of their slaves and domestics, who either from birth or interest were attached to the cause of the enemy. At the hour of midnight the Salarian gate was silently opened, and the inhabitants were awakened by the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet. Eleven hundred and sixty-three years after the foundation of Rome, the Imperial city which had subdued and civilized so considerable a part of mankind, was delivered to the licentious fury of the tribes of Germany and Scythia.

In the pillage of Rome preference was given to gold and jewels; but after these portable riches had been removed by the more diligent robbers, the palaces of Rome were rudely stripped of their splendid and costly furniture. The sideboards of massy plate, and the variegated wardrobes of silk and purple, were irregularly piled in the wagons that always followed the march of a Gothic army. The most exquisite works of art were roughly handled or wantonly destroyed: many a statue was melted for the

sake of the precious materials; and many a vase in the division of the spoil was shattered into fragments by the stroke of a battle-axe.

The retreat of the victorious Goths, who evacuated Rome on the sixth day might be the result of prudence but it was not surely the effect of fear. At the head of an army encumbered with rich and weighty spoils, Alaric advanced along the Appian Way into the southern provinces of Italy, destroying whatever dared to oppose his passage, and contenting himself with the plunder of the unresisting country. Yet even the possession of Sicily he considered only as an intermediate step to the important expedition which he already meditated against the continent of Africa. The straits of Rhegium and Messina are twelve miles in length and in the narrowest passage about one mile and a half broad; and the fabulous monsters of the deep, the rocks of Scylla and the whirlpool of Charybdis, could terrify none but the most timid and unskilled mariners. Yet as soon as the first division of the Goths had embarked, a sudden tempest arose, which sank or scattered many of the transports; their courage was daunted by the terrors of a new element; and the whole design was defeated by the premature death of Alaric, which fixed, after a short illness, the fatal term of his conquests.³¹

[We omit the story of Attila, the Hun, the "Scourge of God," who came down upon Constantinople, conquered it, and levied a tribute from the emperor of the Eastern Roman empire. He then moved westward. The inhabitants of Europe—Italians, Goths, Franks, Germans, and Gauls combined to stop Attila's progress. Under the Roman general Aëtius, they defeated him at Chalons—east of Paris—in 451 A. D. Two years later he plundered the cities of northern Italy. It was at this time that the Veneti fled to the morasses that became Venice. Attila threatened Rome, but was persuaded by Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome to withdraw his men.

We omit also the story of the sack of Rome in 455 A. D. by Geiseric, or Genseric, the Vandal, who with his followers plundered the city for fourteen days.]

THE FALL OF ROME 476 A. D.

Odoacer

The nations who had asserted their independence after the death of Attila were established, by the right of possession or

³¹ Special topic: Alaric's burial.

conquest, in the boundless countries to the north of the Danube; or in the Roman provinces between the river and the Alps. But the bravest of their youth enlisted in the army of *confederates*, who formed the defence and the terror of Italy.

The precarious sovereign of Italy was only permitted to choose whether he would be the slave or the victim of his barbarian mercenaries. The dangerous alliance of these strangers had oppressed and insulted the last remains of Roman freedom and dignity. At each revolution their pay and privileges were augmented; but their insolence increased in a still more extravagant degree; they envied the fortune of their brethren in Gaul, Spain, and Africa, whose victorious arms had acquired an independent and perpetual inheritance; and they insisted on their peremptory demand that a third part of the lands of Italy should be immediately divided among them.

Odoacer, a bold barbarian, assured his fellow-soldiers that, if they dared to associate under his command, they might soon extort the justice which had been denied to their dutiful petitions. From all the camps and garrisons of Italy the *confederates*, actuated by the same resentment and the same hopes, impatiently flocked to the standard of this popular leader. The helpless Augustulus³² who could no longer command the respect, was reduced to implore the clemency, of Odoacer.

[Odoacer persuaded the Roman senate to ask the emperor of the Eastern Roman empire at Constantinople to give Odoacer the title of Patrician and the administration of the "diocese of Italy" which he would hold subject to the Eastern empire. His request was granted. Gibbon briefly gives the causes of the fall of the western Roman empire as "military license, capricious despotism, and elaborate oppression." In the Roman armies were many hired barbarian soldiers, who would sympathize with the invaders; on the throne were weakling, puppet, emperors; in the cities were found luxury, crime, and the very worst forms of slavery.]

Odoacer was the first barbarian who reigned in Italy, over a people who had once asserted their just superiority above the rest of mankind. He was not unworthy of the high station to which

³² The little Augustus, Emperor of the Western Roman empire 475-476 A. D.

his valor and fortune had exalted him: his savage manners were polished by the habits of conversation; and he respected, though a conqueror and a barbarian, the institutions, and even the prejudices, of his subjects. Italy was protected by the arms of its conqueror; and its frontiers were respected by the barbarians of Gaul and Germany, who had so long insulted the feeble race of Theodosius. Rome after a long period of defeat and disgrace, might claim the triumph of her barbarian master.

Theodoric

After a reign of fourteen years, Odoacer was conquered by Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, who restored an age of peace and prosperity, and whose name still excites and deserves the attention of mankind. Odoacer, in the midst of a solemn banquet, was stabbed by the hand, or at least by the command of his rival, Theodoric.³³

After the example of the last emperors, Theodoric preferred the residence of Ravenna, where he cultivated an orchard with his own hands. As often as the peace of his kingdom was threatened (for it was never invaded) by the barbarians, he removed his court to Verona on the northern frontier, and the image of his palace, still extant on a coin, represents the oldest and most authentic model of Gothic architecture.

One record of his fame, the volume of public epistles composed by Cassiodorus in the royal name, is still extant, and has obtained more implicit credit than it seems to deserve. The reputation of Theodoric, however, may repose with more confidence on the visible peace and prosperity of a reign of thirty-three years, the unanimous esteem of his own times, and the memory of his wisdom and courage, his justice and humanity, which was deeply impressed on the minds of the Goths and Italians.

The ministers of Theodoric, Cassiodorus and Boethius, have reflected on his reign the lustre of their genius and learning. More

³³ The early life, education, and conquests of Theodoric, though not so important may be given as a special topic.

prudent or more fortunate than his colleague, Cassiodorus preserved his own esteem without forfeiting the royal favor; and after passing thirty years in the honors of the world, he was blessed with an equal term of repose in the devout and studious solitude of Squillace.

The senator Boethius is the last of the Romans whom Cato or Tully could have acknowledged for their countryman. Such conspicuous merit was felt and rewarded by Theodoric: the dignity of Boethius was adorned with the titles of consul and patrician, and his talents were usefully employed in the important station of master of the offices.

Boethius had always pitied, and often relieved, the distress of the provincials, whose fortunes were exhausted by public and private rapine; and he alone had courage to oppose the tyranny of the barbarians, elated by conquest, excited by avarice, and, as he complains, encouraged by impunity. [He was accused of inviting the emperor of the East (Justin I 518-527) to deliver Italy from the Goths.] Yet his innocence must be presumed, since he was deprived by Theodoric of the means of justification, and rigorously confined in the tower of Pavia, while the senate at the distance of five hundred miles, pronounced a sentence of confiscation and death against him.

While Boethius, oppressed with fetters, expected each moment the sentence or the stroke of death, he composed in the tower of Pavia the *Consolation of Philosophy*; a golden volume not unworthy of the leisure of Plato or Tully, but which claims incomparable merit from the barbarism of the times and the situation of the author. Suspense the worst of evils, was at length ended by the ministers of death, who executed and perhaps exceeded the inhuman mandate of Theodoric. In the last hours of Boethius he derived some comfort from the safety of his two sons, of his wife, and of his father-in-law, the venerable Symmachus. But the grief of Symmachus was indiscreet, and perhaps disrespectful: he had presumed to lament, he might dare to revenge, the death of Boethius. He was dragged in chains from Rome to

the palace of Ravenna, and the suspicions of Theodoric could only be appeased by the blood of Symmachus.

After a life of virtue and glory, Theodoric was now descending with shame and guilt into the grave. One evening, as it is related, when the head of a large fish was served on the royal table, he suddenly exclaimed that he beheld the angry countenance of Symmachus, his eyes glaring fury and revenge, and his mouth armed with long, sharp teeth, which threatened to devour him. The monarch instantly retired to his chamber, and, as he lay trembling with aguish cold, he expressed in broken murmurs to his physician his deep repentance for the murders of Boethius and Symmachus. His malady increased, and after three days, he expired in the palace of Ravenna, in the thirty-third year of his reign.³⁴

He had divided his treasures and provinces between his two grandsons. Amalaric was given the throne of Spain. Italy, with all the conquests of the Ostrogoths, was bequeathed to Athalaric, whose age did not exceed ten years.

[We pass now from the history of the Western Roman empire to a glance at that of the Eastern Roman empire during the reign of the great Justinian.]

JUSTINIAN THE GREAT (527-565)

The aged emperor Justin adopted the talents and ambition of his nephew Justinian, an aspiring youth, whom his uncle had drawn from the rustic solitude of Dacia, and educated at Constantinople as the heir of his private fortune, and at length of the Eastern empire.

The magnificence of Justinian was displayed in the superior pomp of his public spectacles. The expense of his consulship was esteemed at two hundred and twenty-eight thousand pieces of gold; twenty lions and thirty leopards were produced at the same time in the amphitheatre; and a numerous train of horses, with

³⁴ Special topic: The tomb of Theodoric at Ravenna.

their rich trappings, was bestowed as an extraordinary gift on the victorious charioteers of the circus.

After some time the languor of mind and body to which Justin was reduced by an incurable wound in his thigh, indispensably required the aid of a guardian. He summoned the patriarch and senators, and in their presence solemnly placed the diadem on the head of his nephew, who was conducted from the palace to the circus, and saluted by the loud and joyful applause of the people. From that instant, Justinian, in the forty-fifth year of his age, was acknowledged the lawful sovereign of the East.

From his elevation to his death, Justinian governed the Eastern Roman empire, over thirty-eight years. The events of his reign are related by the secretary of Justinian's general Belisarius—Procopius—who successively composed the history, the panegyric, and the satire of his own times.

Justinian reigned over sixty-four provinces and nine hundred and thirty-five cities. The orthodox faith at that time confined the habitable world to one temperate zone, and represented the earth as an oblong surface, four hundred days' journey in length, two hundred in breadth, encompassed by the ocean and covered by the solid crystal of the firmament.

[Justinian, by the aid of his generals, conquered the kingdom of the Vandals in Africa and that of the Goths in Italy, thus restoring both northern Africa and Italy to the position of provinces of the Eastern empire. His work in beautifying the city of Constantinople may well be taken up as a special topic. His attitude towards the teachings of the Greek philosophers is probably not very important to the pupil. But his greatest work, that of simplifying the great mass of Roman law that was the accumulation of over a thousand years of government, must be remembered.]

Justinian's Work for Law

When Justinian ascended the throne, the reformation of the Roman law was an arduous but indispensable task. In the space of ten centuries the infinite variety of laws and legal opinions had

filled many thousand volumes, which no fortune could purchase and no capacity could digest. Books could not easily be found; and the judges, poor in the midst of riches, were reduced to the exercise of their illiterate discretion. The subjects of the Greek provinces were ignorant of the language that disposed of their lives and properties; and the *barbarous* dialect of the Latins was imperfectly studied in the academies.

In the first year of his reign, Justinian directed the faithful Tribonian,³⁵ and nine learned associates, to revise the ordinances of his predecessors, as they were contained, since the time of Hadrian, in the old codes; to purge the errors and contradictions, to retrench whatever was obsolete or superfluous, and to select the wise and salutary laws best adapted to the practice of the tribunals and the use of his subjects. The work was accomplished in fourteen months; and the twelve books—the new Code of Justinian—was honored with his name, and confirmed with his royal signature.

A more arduous operation was still behind—to extract the spirit of the law from the decisions and conjectures, the questions and disputes, of the Roman civilians. Seventeen lawyers, with Tribonian at their head, were appointed by the emperor to exercise an absolute jurisdiction over the works of their predecessors. Two thousand treatises were comprised in an abridgment of fifty books; and it has been carefully recorded that three millions of lines or sentences were reduced in this abstract to the moderate number of one hundred and fifty thousand. The *Code*, the *Pandects*, and the *Institutes*³⁶ were declared to be the legitimate system of civil jurisprudence. James Bryce, the British statesman and jurist says: “The Latin volume which we now call the *Digest* or *Pandects* is by far the most precious monument of the legal genius of the Romans, and indeed, whether one regards the intrinsic merits of its substance or the prodigious influence it has exerted and still exerts, the most remarkable law-book that the world has seen.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th ed.) 15:597.

³⁵ one of Justinian's most learned and prominent gaestors.

³⁶ The *Institutes* formed a more simple outline of the laws.

XV—CHRISTIANITY¹

The condition of the civilized nations at the birth of Christ was propitious for the introduction and spread of a new religion. The old mythological religions had fallen into decay and lost their hold on the intelligent class. Nothing had arisen to fill the void thus created. The loss of faith, as might be expected, engendered the two extremes of superstition and infidelity, neither of them satisfying, and both repugnant to the best minds. Philosophy had done an important work in enlarging and educating the intellect, but it had proved itself in the main powerless to keep alive religious faith, to curb the passions, or to provide hope and consolation in distress. Meantime the whole course of events which resulted in the upbuilding of imperial Rome had produced and diffused abroad in the civilized nations a profligacy which probably has had no parallel, before or since, in the annals of the race. The loosening of the bonds of morality, the prevalence of vice, not to dwell on the remorse and fears of conscience that haunted souls not hardened in evil, could not fail to awaken in many a sense of the need of a more effectual restraint than heathen worship, or Greek letters and philosophy, or Roman civil law could furnish. There was a craving, more or less obscurely felt, for a new regenerating force that should enter with life-giving efficacy into the heart of ancient society. The age was ripe and ready for the incoming of such an epoch.

When Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judea, which was four years before the date assigned in our calendar for the beginning of the Christian era, the Roman world was governed by Augustus Caesar.

The Jews, from the time of Hyrcanus II (63–40 B. C.) the last of the Maccabean rulers, had been subject to the Romans. By their will and consent, Herod (37–4 B. C.), the son of Antipater, was made king. When Herod, an able ruler but a tyrant,

¹ Taken from *The History of the Christian Church* by George Park Fisher by kind permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

died, his kingdom was parcelled out among his three sons. Later Judea was annexed to the province of Syria, and ruled by procurators, one of whom was Pontius Pilate, 26-36 A. D. Later, for a short time, the dominions of Herod were united under his grandson, Herod Agrippa I (41-44 A. D.). Judea was the hearth-stone of the whole Jewish race, and contained within it the sanctuary to which Jews resorted at the great religious festivals. Jews were found in large numbers in almost all parts of the empire. In Alexandria and its neighborhood they numbered not less than a million. Under the Ptolemies the Old Testament had been rendered into Greek (c. 250 B. C.), and this version, called the Septuagint, was in general use among the Hellenists, or Jews of the Dispersion, beyond the limits of Palestine. In Antioch and in other places in Syria, in the numerous cities of Asia Minor, in Cyprus, Crete, and other islands of the Mediterranean, in the cities of Greece, in Illyricum, in Rome and in other towns of Italy, Jews had settled in large numbers.

In this way monotheistic faith [belief in one God] and worship had been planted in the Roman provinces and beyond their borders. Along with their immovable faith and their intense devotion to the law, the Jews in general looked for the coming of the day when the relation of ruler and subject would be reversed. They longed for the hour when they would be delivered from the galling yoke of foreign rule, and when dominion would be transferred to Jehovah's chosen people. The current interpretations of prophecy varied in form; but the prevalent hope was of a political Messiah, who would throw off the hateful Roman domination, and give victory, and with it rest and comfort, to Israel. His throne was to be erected at Jerusalem. To the temple on Mount Zion all nations were to bring their gifts and oblations.

In this state of things . . . a great excitement was kindled by the preaching of John the Baptist, a prophet who in his stern and fearless spirit, as well as in his rough garb and austere mode of life, brought to mind his precursor, the ancient Elijah. In the wild and thinly settled region west of the Jordan he proclaimed to

the awe-struck multitude, who flocked to hear him, the speedy advent of the Lord, and exhorted them to repentance. One of those who presented themselves for baptism was Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Mary, whose husband was Joseph. John would fain have declined to baptize him, and pointed him out as the predicted Messiah. Some of the disciples of the Baptist attached themselves to Jesus.² Beginning at that time, the ministry of Christ continued for three and a half years, partly in Galilee, and in part, especially towards the end, in Jerusalem and its neighborhood. The common people were deeply moved by his teaching, for he spoke as one having authority, out of a deep well of spiritual intuition, and as one in intimate communion with God, by whom he declared himself to be sent....

But when he refused to countenance their longing for a violent revolution and for a temporal kingdom, they were easily persuaded to turn against him. At the same time, the Pharisees, stung by his unsparing exposure of their hypocrisy and spiritual pride, and dreading the overthrow of their influence, conspired to destroy him. The combination of leaders and populace resulted in his seizure, his arraignment before Caiaphas and Pilate, and his crucifixion. He had looked forward to this result. He had watched the thickening cloud of envy and hatred which portended the storm that was to burst on his head. At the last, overwhelmed with sorrow, he neither yielded to distrust nor gave way to despair. Nor could his love be overcome by the blindness and malignity of those to whom he came to minister....

The Apostles and the other disciples were Jews who believed that the Messiah had come, had died, had risen, and ascended, and would again appear in a visible form. As devout Jews they resorted to the temple, and kept up all the legal observances of the Mosaic ritual. But they formed together a brotherhood, in

² The twelve followers of Jesus were the fishermen Simon, surnamed Peter, Andrew his brother, James and John, Matthew the publican (collector of taxes for Rome) Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew, Judas Iscariot (of Kerioth in Judea) Simon the Canaanite (of the sect of Zealots) James the son of Alphaeus, and Judas son of a James.

cordial fellowship. Their converts multiplied. The commotion . . . led to the bringing of Peter and John before the Sanhedrim³. The unabashed courage of these unlettered men excited amazement in that tribunal. It was judged expedient to dismiss them with a prohibition to teach in the name of Jesus, which, however, they did not obey. The increase of the popular commotion and the spread of it beyond the limits of the city caused a second arraignment of Peter and John. On this occasion the Sadducees in the council showed special hostility, which was held in check by the temperate and politic advice given by the Pharisaic doctor, Gamaliel. The Apostles were scourged and again forbidden to preach; but they were set free. It is plain that the comparatively peaceful course of things could last only until the disciples should be recognized as a distinct community. A step in this direction was taken in consequence of complaints of neglect in the distribution of alms, that came from the Hellenistic Jewish converts. This resulted in the appointment of a class of officers called deacons, to look after the poor. The success of one of them, Stephen, in his appeals to the Hellenists, his victories in oral debate, and especially the manner in which he set forth the universality of the gospel—which was construed into an attack on the Mosaic system as destined to pass away—roused bitter indignation. Dragged before the Sanhedrim, and summoned to answer his accusers, he went over in a rapid review the whole Jewish history, and broke out at length in a burning denunciation of the crimes that had reached their climax in the murder of the Righteous One. In a frenzy of rage the crowd would hear no more, but hurried him beyond the limits of the city, where he was stoned to death, with his last breath imploring the pardon of his murderers.

The murder of Stephen made an epoch in the history of the infant Church. It was the signal for a persecution that drove the disciples from Jerusalem and dispersed them in the neighboring districts.

³ the great judicial court at Jerusalem.

The most memorable event in relation to the carrying of the gospel beyond the lines of Judaism was the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, or Paul, a name which he probably adopted as a Roman citizen. He belonged to a Jewish family, although his father was possessed of the rights of Roman citizenship. Tarsus was a cultivated city and a prominent seat of Stoic philosophy; yet Paul's training was exclusively Jewish. A scrap here or there from a heathen author, which had probably become a current saying, does not indicate that he had read the classical writers. He was brought up as a rigid Pharisee and sent to Jerusalem, where he had a married sister, to be trained in the school of Gamaliel for the office of rabbi. He had learned the trade of tent-maker, on which he depended for support. He was an approving spectator of the slaying of Stephen, and enlisted with fanatical industry in the work of persecuting the disciples. It was while engaged in this cruel business, in the full assurance that it was a religious and meritorious work, that, on the road to Damascus, he had what he afterwards referred to as a vision of Jesus.

[Paul preached first in Damascus, then in Antioch and Jerusalem. Not until after ten or twelve years, probably, did he begin to think of preaching to the Gentiles (non-Jews). Then he went to Cyprus, Galatia (a province in Asia Minor), Philippi, Thessalonica, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, Macedonia, and Rome. His letters to the Christian Churches of that time are the earliest sources of our knowledge of the early Christian church. He is believed to have been beheaded in 67 A. D.]

At the time of Paul's death, the great Jewish war—the result of which was the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in 66 A. D.—had already begun. The growing fanaticism of the Jews broke out against the Christians, who did not sympathize with their determination to revolt. From the accession of Vespasian (69–79), the Church had been left at peace for almost thirty years. Domitian (81–96) towards the close of his reign subjected the Christians at Rome to savage persecution. Nerva (96–98), who succeeded this tyrant, was a mild prince. He reversed in all points the policy of his predecessor.

With Trajan (98–117) there began a new era in the adminis-

tration of the world's government. Sagacious, just, good-tempered, simple in his ways, taking pleasure in the company of men like Tacitus and the younger Pliny, he might be expected to be averse to severe measures against his Christian subjects. Of the rapid growth of the Church, at least in certain places, we have an interesting proof in the correspondence of Trajan with Pliny, who was *propraetor* in Bithynia (in Asia Minor). These letters, moreover, bring us to a landmark in the record of Roman persecutions. Pliny, writing in 111 A. D. represents that in that region many of both sexes, of all ages, and of every rank were accused of being Christians. This "superstition" as he calls Christianity, had diffused itself in country places as well as in cities. The temples of the heathen gods had been almost forsaken. Victims for sacrifice had found few purchasers. He desired special instruction as to the method of dealing with this sect that had grown to be so numerous. In reply, Trajan decides that they are to be let alone, unless they are prosecuted by an accuser who gives his name. If convicted, in case they refuse to supplicate the gods, they are to be punished.

Under Marcus Aurelius (161-180), Christians suffered both from popular fury and from the government. The virtuous emperors were the most resolute in the attempt to keep out religious innovation. This wise and philosophic ruler finds in the bearing of Christian martyrs only signs of obstinacy.

The catacombs at Rome are ancient burial-places of Christians, excavated for this purpose; for the Christians did not adopt the Roman practice of cremation. The winding ways in these subterranean sepulchres are several hundred miles in length. The date of the earliest Christian inscription is 72 A. D.

The last and most formidable of all the persecutions broke out under Diocletian. He determined to exterminate the Christian religion and to reinstate the ancient system of worship. A series of edicts, each more rigorous than the preceding, were deliberately framed for the accomplishment of his purpose. The Roman prisons were soon filled with Christians. After the abdication of Diocletian, the influence of Constantius Chlorus, who presided

over Gaul, Britain, and Spain, and had used his power to protect Christians, became more potent. But the new Caesars, Maximinus, and Galerius kept up their savage proceedings. At length in 311, Galerius utterly changed his course and proclaimed toleration. In 313, Constantine, now sole ruler of the West, in connection with his colleague in the empire, Licinius, issued, at Milan, an edict of full toleration for both religions. It was an event of momentous importance in the history of the Christian religion. The Roman empire, from being the enemy and persecutor of the Church, thenceforward became its protector and patron. The Church entered into an alliance with the State, which was to prove fruitful of consequences, both good and evil, in the subsequent history of Europe. Christianity was now to reap the advantages and to incur the dangers arising from the friendship of earthly rulers and from a close connection with the civil authority.⁴

Clement of Rome tells us that the apostles set over the churches presbyters and deacons, and provided that their places should be filled by other worthy men to be appointed by them with the concurrence of the Church.

Country churches, formed under the auspices of a neighboring city church were affiliated with it, and had for their pastor a presbyter from the parent church, subject to its bishop. Thus each city bishop had a jurisdiction covering the town and the vicinity. The bishop of the metropolis of each Roman province naturally acquired a precedence over other bishops within its limits. The title *Papa*⁵ (Pope), applied elsewhere in the West as a title of honor to all bishops, and in the East as a special title of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, became as early as the be-

⁴ The division by Diocletian of the Roman empire into two parts soon resulted in the division of the Christian church into the Roman church and the Greek church.

But our modern method of counting time was not used in Italy until the sixth century, when it was inaugurated by the Roman abbot Dionysius the Little. It was not used in Gaul before the eighth century. It was in use in England before the close of the eighth century.

⁵ The Latin word meant *father*. Compare the words: papal, papacy, etc.

ginning of the sixth century the exclusive designation of the bishops of Rome.⁶

When Christianity was made the religion of the empire, it became also the fashion of a luxurious and decaying society. The ascetic tendency became so strong in the Church life of this period that it engendered a monasticism highly developed in its various phases. The state of the times stimulated a desire for ascetic retirement. The world was falling to pieces morally as well as politically. The purity of the Church was imperiled by the influx of nominal Christianity. A feeling of alarm took possession of many serious minds. Some who lacked the courage to enter into conflict with the growing depravity looked for a secure retreat from the vanities and uncertainties of ordinary life. Others, and among them not a few noble-minded men thought that the true conquest of an evil world was to be achieved by withdrawing from it.

[The study of monasticism, is in itself a pretty big subject. But a little can be learned about it by assigning to the class as a whole such topics as: Early ascetics (such as Saint Simeon Stylites, St. Anthony, St. Basil of Caesarea, St. Benedict; the monastic orders, such as the Dominicans, the Carmelites, the Benedictines, the Franciscans; St. Francis of Assisi; possibly some of the monastic orders of the twentieth century; possibly a debate on the relative values of asceticism and non-ascetism. A few pupils, probably, will enjoy reading the poems "St. Simeon Stylites," by Tennyson, and "Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister" and "Fra Lippo Lippi" by Robert Browning.]

⁶ Pope Gregory VII, who died in 1085, was the first to decree that the title should be used *only* by the Bishop of Rome.

XVI—MOHAMMED (OR MAHOMET)¹

In the vacant space between Persia, Syria, Egypt, and Æthiopia, the Arabian peninsula may be conceived as a triangle of spacious but irregular dimensions; the southern basis presents a front of a thousand miles to the Indian ocean. In the dreary waste of Arabia a boundless level of sand is intersected by sharp and naked mountains; and the face of the desert, without shade or shelter, is scorched by the direct and intense rays of a tropical sun. Instead of refreshing breezes, the winds, particularly from the southwest, diffuse a noxious and even deadly vapor; the hills of sand which they alternately raise and scatter are compared to the billows of the ocean, and whole caravans, whole armies, have been lost in the whirlwind. The common benefits of water are an object of desire and contest; and the pilgrim of Mecca, after many a dry and sultry march is disgusted by the taste of the waters which have rolled over a bed of sulphur or salt.

In the portrait of the modern Bedouins we may trace the features of their ancestors, who in the age of Moses or Mahomet, dwelt under similar tents, and conducted their horses and camels and sheep to the same springs. In the sands of Africa and Arabia the camel is a sacred and precious gift. That strong and patient beast of burden can perform, without eating and drinking, a journey of several days; and a reservoir of fresh water is preserved in a large bag, a fifth stomach of the animal; the larger breed is capable of transporting a weight of a thousand pounds; and the dromedary, of a lighter and more active frame, outstrips the fleetest courser in the race.

The religion of the Arabs consisted in the worship of the sun, the moon, and the fixed stars. In their nocturnal marches they steered by the guidance of the stars; their names, and order, and daily station were familiar to the curiosity and devotion of the Bedouin.

Mahomet, or more properly Mohammed, was born at Mecca,

¹ Taken from *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* by Gibbon.

four years after the death of Justinian. I cannot perceive in the life of Mahomet that his prospect was far extended beyond the limits of the Arabian world. But from every region of that solitary world the pilgrims of Mecca were annually assembled by the calls of devotion and commerce: in the free concourse of multitudes, a simple citizen, in his native tongue, might study the political state and character of the tribes, the theory and practice of the Jews and Christians.

From his earliest youth Mahomet was addicted to religious contemplation; each year, during the month of Ramadan, he withdrew from the world, in the cave of Hera, three miles from Mecca. The prophet of Mecca rejected the worship of idols and men, of stars and planets. In the Author of the universe his rational enthusiasm confessed and adored an infinite and eternal being, without form or place, without issue or similitude, present to our most secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of his own nature, and deriving from himself all moral and intellectual perfection.

Three years were silently employed in the conversion of fourteen proselytes, the first-fruits of his mission; but in the fourth year he assumed the prophetic office, and, resolving to impart to his family the light of divine truth, he prepared a banquet, a lamb, as it is said, and a bowl of milk, for the entertainment of forty guests. "Friends and kinsmen," said Mahomet to the assembly, "I offer you, and I alone can offer, the most precious of gifts, the treasures of this world and of the world to come. God has commanded me to call you to his service. Who among you will support my burden? Who among you will be my companion and my vizir?" No answer was returned, till the silence of astonishment, and doubt, and contempt was at length broken by the impatient courage of Ali, a youth in the fourteenth year of his age. "O prophet, I am the man: whoever rises against thee, I will dash out his teeth, tear out his eyes. O prophet I will be thy vizir over them." Mahomet accepted his offer with transport. He persevered ten years in the exercise of his mission; and the religion which has overspread the East and the West advanced with a slow and painful progress within the walls of Mecca.

But the people of Mecca were hardened in their unbelief. Mohammed's death was resolved; and they agreed that a sword from each tribe should be buried in his heart. An angel or a spy revealed their conspiracy, and flight was the only resource of Mahomet. At the dead of night, accompanied by his friend Abubeker, he silently escaped from his house: the assassins watched at the door; but they were deceived by the figure of Ali who reposed on the bed, and was covered with the green vestment of the apostle.

Three days Mahomet and his companion were concealed in a cave.² No sooner was the pursuit abated than the two fugitives issued from the rock and mounted their camels. The flight of the prophet from Mecca to Medina (622 A. D.) has fixed the memorable era of the Hejira (flight), which, at the end of twelve centuries, still is the year one to the Mohammedan nations.

The religion of the Koran might have perished in its cradle had not Medina embraced with faith and reverence the holy outcasts of Mecca. Seventy-three men and two women of Medina held a solemn conference with Mahomet, his kinsman and his disciples, and pledged themselves to each other by a mutual oath of fidelity.

From his establishment at Medina Mahomet assumed the exercise of the regal and sacerdotal office; and it was impious to appeal from a judge whose decrees were inspired by the divine wisdom. After a reign of six years, fifteen hundred Moslems, in arms and in the field, renewed their oath of allegiance. Till the age of sixty-three the strength of Mahomet was equal to the temporal and spiritual fatigues of his mission.

The good sense of Mahomet despised the pomp of royalty; the apostle of God submitted to the menial offices of the family; he kindled the fire, swept the floor, milked the ewes, and mended with his own hands his shoes and his woollen garment. Disdaining

² A spider's web and a pigeon's nest are said to have saved them.

the penance and merit of a hermit, he observed without effort or vanity the abstemious diet of an Arab and a soldier.³

The faith which, under the name of Islam, he preached to his family and nation, is compounded of an eternal truth and a necessary fiction, that there is only one God, and that Mahomet is the apostle of God. The sublime truths announced by the prophet are firmly held by his disciples, and defined with metaphysical precision by the interpreters of the Koran. The authority and station of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Christ, and Mahomet, rise in just gradation above each other; but whoever hates or rejects any one of the prophets is numbered with the infidels.

The substance of the Koran, according to himself or his disciples, is uncreated and eternal. A paper copy, in a volume of silk and gems, was brought down to the lowest heaven by the angel Gabriel, who successively revealed the chapters and verses to the Arabian prophet. The word of God and of the apostle was diligently recorded by his disciples on palm-leaves and the shoulder-bones of mutton; and the pages, without order or connection, were cast into a domestic chest in the custody of one of his wives. Two years after the death of Mahomet, the sacred volume was collected and published by his friend and successor Abubeker: the work was revised by the caliph Othman, in the thirtieth year of the Hejira: and the various editions of the Koran assert the same miraculous privilege of an uniform and incorruptible text.

The votaries of Mahomet are more assured than himself of his miraculous gifts; and their confidence and credulity increase as they are farther removed from the time and place of his spiritual exploits. They believe or affirm that trees went forth to meet him, that he was saluted by stones; that water gushed from his fingers; that he fed the hungry, cured the sick, and raised the dead; that a beam groaned to him; that a camel complained to him; that a shoulder of mutton informed him of its being poisoned;

³ The original materials for the life of Mahomet are: The Koran, The traditions of Mahomet's followers, Some poetical works, The earliest Arabian biographies of the prophet. Mahomet is believed to have been unable to read or write. Islam means "reconciled" and is used instead of the word Mohammedanism. The Mohammedans are often spoken of as Muslims or Moslems—the reconciled.

and that both animate and inanimate nature were equally subject to the apostle of God. His dream of a nocturnal journey is seriously described as a real and corporeal transaction. A mysterious animal, the Borak, conveyed him from the temple of Mecca to that of Jerusalem: with his companion Gabriel he successively ascended the seven heavens, and received and repaid the salutations of the patriarchs, the prophets, and the angels, in their respective mansions. Beyond the seventh heaven Mahomet alone was permitted to proceed; he passed the veil of unity, approached within two bow-shots of the throne, and felt a cold that pierced him to the heart, when his shoulder was touched by the hand of God. After this familiar though important conversation, he again descended to Jerusalem, remounted the Borak, returned to Mecca, and performed in the tenth part of a night the journey of many thousand years.

According to the tradition of the nocturnal journey, the apostle, in his personal conference with the Deity, was commanded to impose on his disciples the daily obligation of fifty prayers. By the advice of Moses, he applied for an alleviation of this intolerable burden: the number was gradually reduced to five. The devotion of the faithful is repeated at daybreak, at noon, in the afternoon, in the evening, and at the first watch of the night; and in the present decay of religious fervor, our travellers are edified by the profound humility and attention of the Turks and Persians. Cleanliness is the key of prayer; the frequent washing of the hands, the face, and the body, which was practised of old by the Arabs, is solemnly enjoined by the Koran; and a permission is formally granted to supply with sand the scarcity of water. Five times every day the eyes of the nations at Astracan, at Fez, at Delhi, are devoutly turned to the holy temple of Mecca.

The interdiction of wine, peculiar to some orders of priests or hermits, is converted by Mahomet alone into a positive and general law; and a considerable portion of the globe has abjured, at his command, the use of liquor.

At the final judgment of mankind, after the greater part of mankind has been condemned for their opinions, the true believers

only will be judged by their actions. The sentence will be pronounced, and all, without distinction, will pass over the sharp and perilous bridge of the abyss; but the innocent, treading in the footsteps of Mahomet, will gloriously enter the gates of paradise, while the guilty will fall into the first and the mildest of the seven hells. The term of expiation will vary from nine hundred to seven thousand years; but the prophet has judiciously promised that all his disciples, whatever may be their sins, shall be saved, by their own faith and his intercession, from eternal damnation.

It is natural enough that an Arabian prophet should dwell with rapture on the groves, the fountains, and the rivers of paradise; but instead of inspiring the blessed inhabitants with a liberal taste for harmony and science, conversation and friendship, he idly celebrates the pearls and diamonds, the robes of silk, palaces of marble, dishes of gold, rich wines, artificial dainties, numerous attendants, and the whole train of sensual and costly luxury, which becomes insipid to the owner, even in the short period of this mortal life. Seventy-two Houris, or black-eyed girls of resplendent beauty, blooming youth, virgin purity, and exquisite sensibility, will be created for the use of the meanest believer; a moment of pleasure will be prolonged to a thousand years, and his faculties will be increased an hundred fold, to render him worthy of his felicity.

From all sides the roving Arabs were allured to the standard of religion and plunder. "The sword is the key of heaven and of hell: a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer: whosoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven: and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim." The intrepid souls of the Arabs were fired with enthusiasm: the picture of the invisible world was strongly painted on their imagination; and the death which they had always despised became an object of hope and desire. The Koran inculcates, in the most absolute sense, the tenets of fate and predestination, which would extinguish both industry and virtue, if the actions of man were governed by such a belief.

The death of Mahomet was the signal of independence. A small and faithful band of his primitive disciples had listened to his eloquence, and shared his distress; the increasing myriads who acknowledged Mahomet as their king and prophet had been compelled by his arms, or allured by his promises.

At the end of the first century of the Hejira the caliphs were the most potent and absolute monarchs of the globe. The conquest of Africa, from the Nile to the Atlantic ocean, was first attempted by the caliph Othman. Under the last of the Omniades [caliphs who ruled from 661-750 A. D.] the Arabian empire extended two hundred days' journey from east to west, from the confines of Tartary and India to the shores of the Atlantic ocean. The language and laws of the Koran were studied with equal devotion at Samarcand and Seville; and the Arabian language was adopted as the popular idiom in all the provinces to the westward of the Tigris.

Constantinople and the Greek fire⁴ might exclude the Arabs from the eastern entrance of Europe; but in the west, on the side of the Pyrenees the provinces of Gaul were threatened and invaded by the conquerors of Spain.

[We shall see later how Mohammedanism was driven out of France in 732 As Duruy says: "The Crescent ruled supreme over two thousand leagues of country, a territory of great length, but narrow, impossible to defend, and offering many points of attack.

The Empire had been built too quickly to endure. Yet no one can say that it has entirely perished who has seen the religion, the language and the laws of the Koran still reigning over the greatest part of the country formerly included in the Arabian Empire. Moreover it handed down to the Europe of the Middle Ages discoveries, arts, and sciences, often borrowed, it is true, from other peoples, but the mere propagation of which sheds a lustre over the Arabian name.

In fact while Europe was lost in the darkness of barbarian ignorance scarce pierced by a single ray, the capitals of Islamism were flooded with a great light of literature, philosophy, arts, and industry Bagdad, Samarcand, Damascus. Cairo, Kairowan, Fez, Grenada, and Cordova were so many great intellectual centres." From Victor Duruy's *History of the Middle Ages*, translated by E. H. and M. D. Whitney and printed by kind permission of Henry Holt and Company.

Special reports on many of these topics will prove very interesting and helpful. So great was the civilization of the Moors that some scholars have seemed to believe that it was a pity that Mohammedanism was driven out of Europe. But surely the teachings of Christianity are nobler than those of the Koran.]

⁴ Probably a use in war of naphtha and sulphur, a mixture which produced a fierce flame. See Gibbon.

XVII—GAUL i.e. FRANCE¹

If one were suddenly carried twenty or thirty centuries backward, into the midst of that which was then called Gaul, one would not recognize France. The same mountains reared their heads; the same plains stretched far and wide; the same rivers rolled on their course. There is no alteration in the physical formation of the country; but its aspect was very different. Instead of fields all trim with cultivation, and all covered with various produce, one would see inaccessible morasses and vast forests, as yet uncleared, peopled with wolves and bears, and even with the urus, or huge wild ox, and with elks too. Great herds of swine, as fierce almost as wolves, tamed only so far as to know the sound of their keeper's horn, wandered about. And three or four centuries before the Christian era, six or seven millions of men lived a bestial life, there, enclosed in dwellings dark and low, the best built of wood and clay, covered with branches or straw, made in a single round piece, open to daylight by the door alone.

The ancients for a long while applied without distinction the name of Celts (Greek *keltōi*) to the peoples who lived in the west and north of Europe, regardless of precise limits, language, or origin. In the century preceding the Christian era, the Gauls, that is, the peoples inhabiting Gaul, are alone called Celts.

[The Celts lived not only in Gaul, but also in the British Isles. Special topics should be given on their characteristics, their religion, their languages, their ancient literature. They were as different from the Teuton as is the modern Celt, or Irishman, from the modern Teuton, or Scandinavian.]

From the conquest of Gaul by Caesar, to the establishment there of the Franks under Clovis, she remained for more than five centuries under Roman dominion; first under the pagan, afterwards under the Christian empire.

Thirty years after the battle of Chalons [451 A. D. See p. 199] the Franks, in Gaul, were not yet united as one nation; several tribes with this name, independent of one another, lived between

¹ We quote from Guizot's *History of France*, which is said to be "not less complete and profound than it is simple and attractive."

the Rhine and the Somme. All that can be distinctly affirmed is, that from 450 to 480 A. D. the two principal Frankish tribes were those of the Salian Franks between the Meuse the ocean and the Somme, and the Ripuarian Franks, east of Belgica on the banks of the Moselle and the Rhine. Meroveus, whose name was perpetuated in his line, was one of the principal chieftains of the Salian Franks; and his son Childeric, who resided at Tournay, where his tomb was discovered in 1655, was the father of Clovis, who succeeded him in 481, and with whom really commenced the kingdom and history of France.

[The Franks were Teutonic tribes. The special topics that were given on the Teutonic characteristics, religion, etc., etc., should be carefully reviewed here. *Frédégaire*, mentioned below, or *Fredegarius*, is the reputed compiler of a history of France up to 642].

Clovis was fifteen or sixteen years old when he became king of the Salian Franks of Tournay. He soon settled himself at Soissons, and from thence set on foot plundering and subjugating expeditions which speedily increased his domains and his wealth, and extended far and wide his fame as well as his ambition. The Franks who accompanied him, like him were pagans; and the treasures of the Christian churches counted for a great deal in the booty they had to divide. Whilst prosecuting his course of plunder and war in Eastern Belgica, Clovis was inspired with a wish to get married. He had heard tell of a young girl, like himself of the Germanic royal line, Clotilde, niece of Gondebaud, at that time king of the Burgundians. The principal historian of this epoch Gregory of Tours, an almost contemporary authority, for he was elected bishop, sixty-two years after the death of Clovis, tells the story.

The marriage of Clovis and Clotilde was, really, a great matter. Clovis and the Franks were still pagans. Clotilde was a Christian.

∴ The consequences of the marriage justified before long the importance which had on all sides been attached to it. Clotilde had a son; she was anxious to have him baptized, and urged her

husband to consent. "The gods you worship," said she, "are nought, and can do nought for themselves or others; they are of wood, or stone, or metal." Clovis resisted, saying, "It is by the command of our gods that all things are created and brought forth. It is plain that your God hath no power; there is no proof even that he is of the race of the gods." But Clotilde prevailed; and she had her son baptized solemnly. The child soon died, and Clovis bitterly reproached the queen, saying, "Had the child been dedicated to my gods he would be alive." Clotilde defended her God and prayed. She had a second son, who was also baptized, and fell sick. "It cannot be otherwise with him than with his brother," said Clovis; "baptized in the name of your Christ, he is going to die." But the child was cured, and lived; and Clovis was pacified and less incredulous of Christ. An event then came to pass which affected him still more. In 496 the Allemannians, a Germanic confederation like the Franks, crossed the river and invaded the settlements of the Franks. Clovis went to the aid of his confederation and attacked the Allemannians near Cologne. The battle was going ill; the Franks were wavering, and Clovis was anxious. Before setting out he had, according to Frédégaire, promised his wife that if he were victorious he would turn Christian. Other chroniclers say that Aurelian, seeing the battle in danger of being lost, said to Clovis, "My lord king, believe only on the Lord of heaven whom the queen, my mistress, preacheth." Clovis cried out with emotion, "Christ Jesus, Thou whom my queen Clotilde calleth the Son of the living God, I have invoked my own gods, and they have withdrawn from me; I believe that they have no power, since they aid not those who call upon them. If Thou give me victory over these foes, I will believe on Thee." The tide of battle turned; the Franks recovered confidence and courage; and the Allemannians, beaten and seeing their king slain, surrendered themselves to Clovis.

On the return of Clovis, Clotilde, fearing he should forget his victory and his promise, "secretly sent," says Gregory of Tours "to St. Remi, bishop of Rheims, and prayed him to penetrate the

king's heart with the words of salvation." "I will listen to thee, most holy father," said Clovis, "willingly, but there is a difficulty. The people that follow me will not give up their gods." However, even before he opened his mouth the greater part of those present cried out, "We abjure the mortal gods; we are ready to follow the immortal God whom Remi preacheth."

To the east, north, and southwest of Paris were settled some independent Frankish tribes, governed by chieftains with the name of kings. So soon as Clovis had settled at Paris, it was his one fixed idea to reduce them all to subjection. He had conquered the Burgundians and the Visigoths; it remained for him to conquer and unite all the Franks. The barbarian showed himself in his true colors, during this new enterprise, with his violence, his craft, his cruelty, and his perfidy.²

It was but right to make the reader intimately acquainted with that great barbarian who, with all his vices and all his crimes, brought about or rather began, two great matters which have already endured through fourteen centuries, and still endure; for he founded the French monarchy and Christian France.

These Merovingian kings were as greedy and licentious as they were cruel. Amidst such passions and such morals, treason, murder and poisoning were the familiar processes of ambition, covetousness, hatred, vengeance, and fear. Eight kings or royal heirs of the Merovingian line died of brutal murder or secret assassination, to say nothing of innumerable crimes of the same kind.³

The last of the kings sprung from Clovis acquitted themselves too ill or not at all of their task; and the *mayors of the palace* were naturally summoned to supply their deficiencies, and to give the

² He hinted to Cloderic, the son of Sigbert king of the Ripuarian Franks that Cloderic kill his father. Cloderic did this, and as a punishment he in his turn was killed by Clovis's order.

³ Emerton says (Intro. to the Mid. Ages 70): "There is hardly a more awful bit of human history than the story of these wars as told by Gregory of Tours." Possible special topics are: The death of Clotilde's grandsons, (see Guizot and Emerton); the death of the king of Thuringia, Emerton, p. 69; etc., etc.

populations assurance of more intelligence and energy in the exercise of power.

Pepin of Landen, called The Ancient, mayor of the palace of Austrasia⁴ died in 639. His grandson Pepin of Heristal, was for twenty-seven years not only virtually as mayor of the palace, but ostensibly and with the title of duke, the real sovereign of Austrasia and all the Frankish dominion. On the death of Pepin of Heristal, the Austrasians set Charles (one of Pepin's sons) at their head proclaiming him Duke of Austrasia. He was destined to become Charles Martel.

[The thrilling account of the battle of Tours, 732 A. D., between the Mohammedans and the Teutons may be given in a special topic. It is one of the great events of history.]

Charles Martel spent his life entirely in two great works, the re-establishment throughout the whole of Gaul of the Franco-Gallo-Roman empire, and the driving back from the frontiers of this empire of the Germans in the north and the Arabs in the south. The consequence of this double success was the victory of Christianity over Paganism and Islamism.

At the head of the Franks as mayor of the palace from 741, and as king from 752, Pepin the Short completed in France and extended in Italy the work which his father, Charles Martel, had begun and carried on from 714 to 741 in State and Church. He left France re-united in one and placed at the head of Christian Europe. He died in the monastery of St. Denis September 18, 768, leaving his kingdom and his dynasty thus ready to the hand of his son whom history has dubbed Charlemagne.

[The word Charlemagne is a softened form of the Latin *Carolus Magnus* or Charles the Great. The family or dynasty of Charles Martel is therefore sometimes spoken of as that of the Carolingians or the Carlovingsians.]

It may be well right here to remind the student that the Frenchman of today has in his veins elements that are Celtic, Roman, and Teutonic. The French language is derived chiefly from the Latin or Roman, while the name of that language and the name of the country come from the Teutonic Frank. An interesting study is to try to trace Celtic, Roman, and Teutonic qualities in the great modern Frenchmen of today such as Clemenceau, Marshal Foch, etc., etc., etc.]

⁴ Clovis's grandsons had divided the kingdom into two parts, the east, Austrasia, and the west, Neustria.

CHARLEMAGNE

The original and dominant characteristic of the hero of this reign, that which won for him, and keeps for him after more than ten centuries, the name of Great, is the striking variety of his ambition, his faculties, and his deeds. Charlemagne aspired to and attained to every sort of greatness, military greatness, political greatness, and intellectual greatness; he was an able warrior, an energetic legislator, a hero of poetry. And he united, he displayed all these merits in a time of general and monotonous barbarism, when, save in the Church, the minds of men were dull and barren.

From 769 to 813, in Germany and western and northern Europe, Charlemagne conducted thirty-one campaigns against the Saxons, Frisons, Bavarians, Avars, Slavons, and Danes; in Italy, five against the Lombards; in Spain, Corsica, and Sardinia, twelve against the Arabs; two against Greeks; and three in Gaul itself, against the Aquitanians and the Britons; in all, fifty-three expeditions; amongst which those he undertook against the Saxons, the Lombards, and the Arabs, were long and difficult wars. . . .

[To place before the reader a fragment of an old chronicle will serve better than any modern description to show the impression of admiration and fear produced upon his contemporaries by Charlemagne, his person and his power. At the close of this ninth century a monk of the abbey of St. Gall, in Switzerland, had collected, direct from the mouth of one of Charlemagne's warriors, Adalbert, numerous stories of his campaigns and his life. These stories are full of fabulous legends, childish anecdotes, distorted reminiscences, and chronological errors; but they reveal the state of men's minds and fancies within the circle of Charlemagne's influence and at the sight of him. This monk gives a naive account of Charlemagne's arrival before Pavia and of the king of the Lombards' disquietude at his approach. Didier⁵ had with him at that time one of Charlemagne's most famous comrades, Ogier the Dane, who fills a prominent place in the romances of that age. Ogier had quarrelled with his great chief and taken refuge with the king of the Lombards. . . . "When Didier and Ogger (for so the monk calls him) heard that the dread monarch was coming, they ascended a tower of vast height, whence they could watch his arrival from afar off and from every quarter. They saw, first of all, engines of war such as must have been necessary for the armies of Darius or Julius Caesar. 'Is not Charles,' asked Didier of Ogger, 'with this great army?' But the other an-

⁵ King of the Lombards.

swered, 'No.' The Lombard, seeing afterwards an immense body of soldiery gathered from all quarters of the vast empire, said to Ogger, 'Certes, Charles advanceth in triumph in the midst of this throng,' 'No, not yet; he will not appear so soon,' was the answer. 'What should we do, then,' rejoined Didier, who began to be perturbed, 'should he come accompanied by a larger band of warriors?' 'You will see what he is when he comes,' replied Ogger, 'but as to what will become of us I know nothing.' As they were thus parleying appeared the body of guards that knew no repose; and at this sight the Lombard, overcome with dread cried, 'This time 'tis surely Charles.' 'No,' answered Ogger, 'not yet.' In their wake came the bishops, the abbots, the ordinaries of the chapels royal, and the counts; and then Didier, no longer able to bear the light of day or to face death, cried out with groans, 'Let us descend and hide ourselves in the bowels of the earth, far from the face and the fury of so terrible a foe.' Trembling the while, Ogger, who knew by experience what were the power and might of Charles, and who had learned the lesson . . . in better days, then said, 'When ye shall behold the crops shaking for fear in the fields, and the gloomy Po and the Ticino overflowing the walls of the city with their waves blackened with steel, then may we think that Charles is coming.' He had not ended these words when there began to be seen in the west, as it were a black cloud, raised by the northwest wind or by Boreas, which turned the brightest day into awful shadows. But as the emperor drew nearer and nearer, the gleam of arms caused to shine on the people shut up within the city a day more gloomy than any kind of night. And then appeared Charles himself, that man of steel, with his head encased in a helmet of steel, his hands garnished with gauntlets of steel, his heart of steel and his shoulders of marble protected by a cuirass of steel, and his left hand armed with a lance of steel which he held aloft in the air, for as to his right hand he kept that continually on the hilt of his invincible sword. The outside of his thighs, which the rest, for their greater ease in mounting a horseback, were wont to leave unshackled even by straps, he wore encircled by plates of steel. What shall I say concerning his boots? All the army were wont to have them invariably of steel; on his buckler there was nought to be seen but steel; his horse was of the color and the strength of steel. All those who went before the monarch, all those who marched at his side, all those who followed after, even the whole mass of the army, had armor of the like sort, so far as the means of each permitted. The fields and the highways were covered with steel: the points of steel reflected the rays of the sun; and this steel, so hard, was borne by a people with hearts still harder. The flash of steel spread terror throughout the streets of the city. 'What steel! alack, what steel!' Such were the bewildered cries the citizens raised. The firmness of manhood and of youth gave way at sight of the steel; and the steel paralyzed the wisdom of graybeards. That which I, poor tale-teller, mumbling and toothless, have attempted to depict in a long description, Ogger perceived at one rapid glance, and said to Didier, 'Here is what ye have so anxiously sought:' and whilst uttering these words he fell down almost lifeless." (Quoted from Guizot.)

Guizot adds, "The monk of St. Gall does King Didier and his people wrong. They resisted Charlemagne obstinately." [Charlemagne had been asked by one Arab leader in Spain to aid in overcoming another Arab leader. But at the appearance of Christians, the Arabs had dropped their own quarrels, and had presented, unexpectedly, a united and hostile front.]

In the year, 778, he began a march towards the Pyrenees. The aggressive campaign was an easy and a brilliant one. Charles with his army entered Spain by the valley of Roncesvalles without encountering any obstacle.

The Arabs demanded negotiation. To decide the king of the Franks upon an abandonment of the siege, they offered him "an immense quantity of gold," say the chroniclers, "hostages, and promises of homage and fidelity." Appearances had been saved; Charlemagne could say, and even perhaps believe, that he had pushed his conquests as far as the Ebro; he decided on retreat, and all the army was set in motion to recross the Pyrenees.

The troops entered those same passes of Roncesvalles which they had traversed without obstacle a few weeks before; and the advance-guard and the main body of the army were already clear of them. The account of what happened shall be given in the words of Eginhard, the only contemporary historian whose account, free from all exaggeration, can be considered authentic.

"The king," he says, "brought back his army without experiencing any loss, save that at the summit of the Pyrenees he suffered somewhat from the perfidy of the Vascons (Basques). Whilst the army of the Franks, embarrassed in a narrow defile, was forced by the nature of the ground to advance in one, long, close line, the Basques, who were in ambush on the crest of the mountain (for the thickness of the forest with which these parts are covered is favorable to ambuscade), descended, and fell suddenly on the baggage-train and on the troops of the rear guard, and precipitated them to the bottom of the valley. There took place a fight in which the Franks were killed to a man. Eginhard, master of the household of the king; Anselm, count of the palace; and Roland, prefect of the marches of Brittany, fell in this engagement."

The disaster of Roncesvalles and the heroism of the warriors who perished there became, in France, the object of popular sympathy and the favorite topic for the exercise of the popular fancy. The *Song of Roland*, a real Homeric poem in its great beauty, and yet rude and simple as became its national character

bears witness to the prolonged importance attained in Europe by this incident in the history of Charlemagne.⁶

Charlemagne might well believe that he had nearly gained his end. He had everywhere greatly extended the frontiers of the Frankish dominions and subjugated the populations. The centre of the dominion was no longer in ancient Gaul; he had transferred it to a point not far from the Rhine, in the midst and within reach of the Germanic populations, at the town of Aix-la-Chapelle, which he had founded, and which was his favorite residence.

[In 799 he received news of serious disturbances in Rome; that Pope Leo III had been attacked by conspirators. Charlemagne arrived in Rome on the 23d of November 800. "On the 25th of December, 800, the day of the Nativity of our Lord," says Eginhard, "the king came into the basilica of the blessed St. Peter, apostle, to attend the celebration of mass. At the moment when, in his place before the altar, he was bowing down to pray, Pope Leo placed on his head a crown, and all the Roman people shouted, 'Long life and victory to Charles Augustus crowned by God, the great and pacific emperor of the Romans!' After this proclamation the pontiff prostrated himself before him and paid him adoration, according to the custom established in the days of the old emperors; and thenceforward Charles, giving up the title of patrician, bore that of Emperor and Augustus."

Eginhard adds, in his *Life of Charlemagne*, "The king at first testified great aversion for this dignity, for he declared that, notwithstanding the importance of the festival, he would not on that day have entered the church, if he could have foreseen the intentions of the sovereign pontiff. However, this event excited the jealousy of the Roman emperors (of Constantinople), who showed great vexation at it; but Charles met their bad graces with nothing but great patience, and thanks to this magnanimity, which raised him so far above them, he managed, by sending to them frequent embassies and giving them in his letters the name of brother, to triumph over their conceit."

No one, probably, believed in the ninth century, and no one, assuredly, will nowadays believe, that Charlemagne was innocent beforehand of what took place on the 25th of December, 800, in the basilica of St. Peter. It is doubtful, also, if he were seriously concerned about the ill-temper of the emperors of the East. He had wit enough to understand the value which always remains attached to old traditions, and he might have taken some pains

⁶ This old French poem, even in a prose translation, may well be read by the class as an example of Celtic color and imagination, as well as of Teutonic ideals.

to secure their countenance to his title of emperor; but all his contemporaries believed, and he also undoubtedly believed, that he had on that day really won and set up again the Roman empire.

What, then, was the government of this empire of which Charlemagne was proud to assume the old title? How did this German warrior govern that vast dominion which, thanks to his conquests, extended from the Elbe to the Ebro, from the North Sea to the Mediterranean; which comprised nearly all Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and the north of Italy and of Spain, and which, sooth to say, was still, when Charlemagne caused himself to be made emperor, scarce more than the hunting-ground and the battlefield of all the swarms of barbarians who tried to settle on the ruins of the Roman world they had invaded and broken to pieces?

Out of this chaos Charlemagne caused to issue a monarchy,⁷ strong through him alone and so long as he was by, but powerless and gone like a shadow when the man was lost to the institution. The figure of Charlemagne alone fills the picture: he is the centre-piece of it and the soul of everything. 'Tis he who wills that the national assemblies should meet and deliberate; 'tis he who inquires into the state of the country; 'tis he who proposes and approves of or rejects the laws; with him rest will and motive, initiative and decision. He has a mind sufficiently judicious, unshackled, and elevated to understand that the nation ought not to be left in darkness about its affairs, and that he himself has need of communicating with it, of gathering information from it, and of learning its opinions. But we have here no exhibition of great political liberties, no people discussing its interests and its business, interfering effectually in the adoption of resolutions, and, in fact, taking in its government so active and decisive a part as to have a right to say that it is self-governing, or, in other words, a free people. It is Charlemagne, and he alone, who governs; it is absolute government marked by prudence, ability, and grandeur.

⁷ Guizot gives nine pages to the details of Charlemagne's form of government.

[To the modern student, however, Charlemagne's greatest work seems, probably, his work for education. It is hardly too much to say that in his educational aims he was a thousand years ahead of his time.]

He drew scholars into the management of affairs. He grouped them about himself as his own habitual advisers, or assigned them as advisers to his sons, or sent them to all points of his empire as commissioners, or charged them in his name with important negotiations. And those whom he did not employ at a distance formed, in his immediate neighborhood, a learned and industrious society, *a school of the palace*, according to some; or an *academy* and not a *school*, according to others, devoted rather to conversation than to teaching. It attended Charlemagne at his various residences, at one time working for him at questions he invited them to deal with, at another giving to his court, to his children and to himself, lessons in grammar, rhetoric, logic, astronomy, geometry, and even theology. Two men, Alcuin and Eginhard, have remained justly celebrated in the literary history of the age. Alcuin was the principal director of the school of the palace, and the favorite, the confidant, the learned adviser of Charlemagne. Eginhard, who was younger, received his scientific education in the school of the palace, and was head of the public works to Charlemagne, before becoming his biographer.

Charlemagne paid great attention to astronomy. Being troubled one day at no longer seeing in the firmament one of the known planets, he wrote to Alcuin, "What thinkest thou of this *Mars*, which, last year, being concealed in the sign of *Cancer*, was intercepted from the sight of men by the light of the sun? Is it the regular course of his revolution? Is it the influence of the sun? Is it a miracle? Could he have been two years about performing the course of a single one?" In theological studies and discussions he exhibited a particular and grave interest. And at the same time, he paid zealous attention to the instruction of the clergy, whose ignorance he deplored; he laid the foundation, in the cathedral churches and the great monasteries, of episcopal and cloistral schools for the education of ecclesiastics; and carrying his solicitude

still farther, he recommended to the bishops and abbots that, in those schools, "they should take care to make no difference between the sons of serfs and of free men, so that they might come and sit on the same benches to study grammar, music, and arithmetic." (Capitularies of 789, art. 70.) Thus in the eighth century, he foreshadowed the extension which, in the nineteenth, was to be accorded to primary instruction, to the advantage and honor not only of the clergy, but also of the whole people.⁸

Eginhard adds further: "In educating his children he determined to train them, both sons and daughters, in those liberal studies to which he himself paid great attention. Further, he made his sons, as soon as their age permitted it, learn to ride like true Franks, and practise the use of arms and hunting. He ordered his daughters to learn wool work and devote attention to the spindle and distaff, for the avoidance of idleness and lethargy, and to be trained to the adoption of high principles.

In speech he was fluent and ready, and could express with the greatest clearness whatever he wished. He was not merely content with his native tongue but took the trouble to learn foreign languages. He learned Latin so well that he could speak it as well as his native tongue; but he could understand Greek better than he could speak it. His fluency of speech was so great that he even seemed sometimes a little garulous.

He paid the greatest attention to the liberal arts, and showed the greatest respect and bestowed high honors upon those who taught them. For his lessons in grammar he listened to the instruction of Deacon Peter of Pisa, an old man; but for all other subjects Albinus, called Alcuin, also a deacon, was his teacher—a man from Britain, of the Saxon race, and the most learned man of his time. Charles spent much time and labor in learning rhetoric and logic, and especially astronomy, from Alcuin. He learned, too the art of reckoning, and with close application scrutinized most carefully the course of the stars. He tried also to learn to write, and for this purpose used to carry with him and keep under the pillow of his couch, tablets and writing-sheets that he might in his spare moments accustom himself to the formation of letters. But he made little advance in this strange task, which was begun too late in life.

In January, 814, he was taken ill of a violent fever, which kept him to his bed. Recurring forthwith to the remedy he ordinarily employed against fever, he abstained from all nourishment, persuaded that this diet would suffice to drive away or at least assuage the malady; but added to the fever came that pain in the side which the Greeks call *pleurisy*; nevertheless the emperor persisted in his abstinence. He expired the 28th of January, 814, in his seventy-first year.

⁸ Compare English schools of the 19th century as pictured by Charles Dickens.

XVIII—FEUDALISM¹

Twenty-nine years after the death of Charlemagne, that is in 843, when by the treaty of Verdun, the sons of Louis the Debonnair (son of Charlemagne) had divided amongst them his dominions, the great empire split up into three distinct and independent kingdoms—the kingdoms of Italy, Germany and France. The split did not stop there. Forty-five years later, at the end of the ninth century, shortly after the death of Charles the Fat, the last of the Carlovingians, this empire had become seven instead of three kingdoms.

In the kingdom of France the same work of dismemberment had gone on. About the end of the ninth century there were already twenty-nine provinces or fragments of provinces which had become petty states, the former governors of which, under the names of dukes, counts, marquises, and viscounts, were pretty nearly real sovereigns. These petty states were not all of equal importance or in possession of a perfectly similar independence; there were certain ties uniting them to other states, but their prevailing feature was, nevertheless, isolation, personal existence.

From the end of the ninth we pass to the end of the tenth century, to the epoch when the Capetians¹ take the place of the Carlovingians. The Emperor Otho the Great² had united the kingdom of Italy to the empire of Allemania (Germany). But in the interior of the kingdom of France, dismemberment had held on its course; and instead of the twenty-nine petty states or great fiefs observable at the end of the ninth century, we find at the end of the tenth, fifty-five actually established.³

There was no great national feeling; no easy and rapid means of communication; mind and life were both confined in a narrow

¹ We continue to quote from Guizot's *History of France*. Hugh Capet and his descendants ruled France from 987 to 1328.

² Special topic: Otto the Great, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

³ They are said to have included altogether 70,000 smaller fiefs.

space, and encountered, at every step, stoppages and obstacles well-nigh insurmountable. At the same time, by the fall of the empires of Rome and of Charlemagne, men regained possession of the rough and ready individual liberties which were the essential characteristic of Germanic manners; Franks, Visigoths, Burgundians, Saxons, Lombards, none of these new peoples had lived as the Greeks and Romans had, under the sway of an essentially political idea, the idea of city, state, and fatherland: they were free men, and not citizens; comrades, not members of one and the same public body. They gave up their vagabond life; they settled upon a soil conquered by themselves and partitioned amongst themselves; and there they lived each by himself, master of himself and all that was his, family, servitors, husbandmen, and slaves: the territorial domain became the fatherland, and the owner remained a free man, a local and independent chieftain, at his own risk and peril. And thus, quite naturally, grew up feudal France, when the newcomers, settled in their new abodes, were no more swayed by the vain attempt to re-establish the Roman empire.

[Feudalism is a great subject in itself. We cannot go into it except most briefly. The word comes from a probable Latin word *feod* or *feodum*, meaning a piece of land. The most powerful man in any province or state—a duke or count, or prince—accepted (nominally) from his under-lords, their lands and their service in war. He in turn gave them back (nominally) their land as a *fief*, and promised them protection. By a symbolic ceremony of placing their hands in his (*homage*) they became his *vassals*. They in turn had *sub-vassals*, who in turn might have other *sub-vassals* and so on. The men of lowest rank were the serfs, who were bought and sold with the land, like a horse or barn. Special topics may well be given on the following words: castles and castle-walls, moats, manor-houses, knights and ladies, squires, armor, tournaments, falconry, etc.

The value of feudalism was that it was better than no government, that it furnished protection to the people, and that it taught men something about governing.

The evils of feudalism lay in the cruelty and wrong-doing of the lords, in the sufferings of the serfs, and in the continual warfare that it developed. Another great evil lay in the fact that a powerful lord might make his wicked, dissolute son, a bishop, or an abbot, or head of some monastery, and that thus the church offices were dragged into the feudal system.]

It was a confederation of petty sovereigns, of petty despots, unequal amongst themselves, and having, one towards another, certain duties and rights, but invested in their own domains, over their personal and direct subjects, with arbitrary and absolute power. That is the essential element of the feudal system; therein it differs from every other aristocracy, every other form of government.

There has been no scarcity in this world of aristocracies and despotisms. But none of these despotic governments was like the feudal system. Liberty, equality, and tranquillity were all alike wanting, from the tenth to the thirteenth century, to the inhabitants of each lord's domains; their sovereign was at their very doors, and none of them was hidden from him, or beyond reach of his mighty arm. The inhabitants of fiefs could not find consolation in the bosom of tranquillity; incessantly mixed up in the quarrels of their lord, a prey to his neighbors' devastations they led a life still more precarious and still more restless than that of the lords themselves, and they had to put up at one and the same time with the presence of war, privilege, and absolute power.

*Chivalry*¹

Chivalry is one of those facts which seem to belong rather to romance than to real history. Nevertheless it really existed, in all its phases. Even in the customs of the German tribes we can trace its faint beginning, in that ceremony where the young man publicly received his shield and javelin, and became a warrior and a citizen by virtue of these insignia. Since then the sword had always been the symbol of a sort of investiture; in 791, at Ratisbon, Charlemagne with great solemnity girded his son Louis the Pious with the sword; in 838 Louis conferred the same honor on Charles the Bald, adding: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Here we see an element of religious consecration already added to the simple ceremony of arming.

¹ From Victor Duruy's *History of the Middle Ages*, by kind permission of Henry Holt and Co.

Now it happened that the noble lords, who were cut off from the rest of the world and yet had sovereign power in their castles, took pleasure in forming little courts for themselves and drawing around them their vassals, who were expected to render personal services, which were not considered humiliating but rather a mark of distinction. These vassals formed a hierarchy, comprising constable, marshal, seneschal, chamberlain, butler, cup-bearer, etc. But the vassals did not come alone to the court of their sovereigns, but were accompanied by their sons, who were to receive there the education and accomplishments of the great castles, and to render services of a certain kind, as, for instance, those of a page, squire, etc. When a young man seemed to be sufficiently accomplished in the art of setting and serving a table and in that of clothing and arming the knight, he was himself made a knight, by a sort of ordination which he received at the hands of his feudal lord, in a solemn ceremonial.

First came a bath, the symbol of the purity which ought to distinguish a knight; a red robe, of the blood he ought to spill; a black robe, of the death that awaited him. A fast of twenty-four hours followed, and after that a night passed in prayer in the church. The next day, after the rites of confession, communion, and a sermon, a consecrated sword was hung about the neck of the applicant, who knelt down before his lord and begged for knighthood. Then the knights, or sometimes the ladies, invested him with spurs, and the hauberk or coat of mail, the cuirass, the armlets, the gauntlets, and finally the sword, after which the lord gave him the accolade, by striking him upon the shoulders three times with the flat of the sword and saying: "In the name of God, of St. Michael, and of St. George, I make thee a knight." The next minute the young cavalier sprang upon his courser, in the middle of the crowd assembled in the courtyard of the castle. A knight's duties were to pray, to avoid sin, to defend the church, the widow and the orphan, to protect the people, to travel far and wide, to make war loyally, to fight for his lady, to love his lord, and to listen to good and true men.

The society of that time, though lawless, had been able to create an ideal of perfection for itself. The man of the Middle Ages looked up to his patron saint as a model in the religious life, and to the knight in civil and political life.

[Feudalism was destroyed when the invention of gunpowder (c. 1500) made castle walls useless as a defense. Knighthood with all the glories of medieval chivalry continued on until it became a mere semblance of its old spirit. Its absolute death-blow was struck when the Spanish writer Cervantes wrote the novel *Don Quixote* (1605-1615).]

XIX—BRITAIN

[In the article on early Britain in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* 11th ed. Dr. F. J. Haverfield of Oxford says: "Geologists are not yet agreed when and by whom Britain was first peopled. Probably the island was invaded by a succession of races. Real knowledge begins with two Celtic invasions, that of the Goidels in the latter part of the Bronze Age, and that of the Brythons and Belgae in the Iron Age. These invaders brought Celtic civilization and dialects. It is uncertain how far they were themselves Celtic in blood and how far they were numerous enough to absorb or obliterate the races which they found in Britain. By the age of Julius Caesar all the inhabitants of Britain, except perhaps some tribes of the far north, were Celts in speech and customs."

The special topics given earlier during the study of Gaul, on Celtic characteristics, Celtic imagination, Druidism, language (Gaelic), should be carefully reviewed, and others should be given such as: possible Celtic remains (Stonehenge, etc.); Celtic words and endings in modern English; Celtic influence on English literature, etc. etc.

Roman Britain can be passed over hastily. Julius Caesar's landings in 55 B. C. and 54 B. C. probably had no effect; but the influence of the Romans during their stay in Britain from 43 A. D. to perhaps 400 A. D. is an interesting question. Topics may be given on: Roman walls; Roman roads; other Roman remains; the effect of Roman civilization on the subjugated Celts etc., and discussions held on the questions: How much Christianity reached the early Celts of Britain? Was St. Patrick, who is said to have brought Christianity to Ireland, a Roman patrician? Did the Romans of this early period give any words or endings to the Celtic language? What events in Rome about 400 A. D. would cause the Roman armies to be called back to Rome?]

THE COMING TO BRITAIN OF THE TEUTONS

Gildas, a Celtic monk who lived probably from 516 to 570, wrote thus:

Britain, deprived of all her soldiery, groaned in amazement for many years under the cruelty of two foreign nations—the Scots from the northwest, and the Picts from the north. The Britons send ambassadors to Rome with letters, entreating in piteous terms the assistance of an armed band to protect them. A legion is immediately sent. When they had crossed over the sea and landed, they came at once to close conflict with their

cruel enemies, and slew great numbers of them. But the Roman legion had no sooner returned home in joy and triumph, than their former foes, like hungry and ravening wolves, rushing with greedy jaws upon the fold which is left without a shepherd, and wafted both by the strength of oarsmen and the blowing wind, break through the boundaries, and spread slaughter on every side, and like mowers cutting down the ripe corn, they cut up, tread under foot, and overrun the whole country.

And now again they send suppliant ambassadors, with their garments rent and their heads covered with ashes, imploring assistance from the Romans, and like timorous chickens, crowding under the protecting wings of their parents, that their wretched country might not altogether be destroyed. Upon this the Romans, moved with compassion, send forward, like eagles in their flight, their unexpected bands of cavalry by land and mariners by sea, and planting their terrible swords upon the shoulders of their enemies, they mow them down like leaves.

But the Romans give notice that they can no longer be harassed by such laborious expeditions, nor suffer the Roman standards to be worn out by sea and by land by fighting against these unwarlike, plundering vagabonds.

No sooner were they gone, than the Picts and Scots, like worms which in the heat of mid-day come forth from their holes, hastily land again from their canoes, all more eager to shroud their villainous faces in bushy hair than to cover with decent clothing their bodies.

Again, therefore, the wretched remnant, sending to Ætius, a powerful Roman citizen, address him as follows:—"To Ætius, now consul for the third time: the groans of the Britons." And again a little further, thus:—"The barbarians drive us to the sea; the sea throws us back on the barbarians: thus two modes of death await us, we are either slain or drowned." The Romans, however, could not assist them....

Then all the councillors, together with that proud tyrant Gurthrigern (Vortigern), the British king, were so blinded, that,

as a protection to their country, they sealed its doom by inviting in among them (like wolves into the sheep-fold), the fierce and impious Saxons, a race hateful both to God and men, to repel the invasions of the northern nations. Nothing was ever so pernicious to our country, nothing was ever so unlucky.¹ What palpable darkness must have enveloped their minds—darkness desperate and cruel! Those very people whom, when absent, they dreaded more than death itself, were invited to reside, as one may say, under the self-same roof. . . . A multitude of whelps came forth from the lair of this barbaric lioness, in three cyuls, as they call them, that is, in three ships of war, with their sails wafted by the wind and with omens and prophecies favourable. . . . They first landed on the eastern side of the island, by the invitation of the unlucky king, and there fixed their sharp talons, apparently to fight in favour of the island, but alas! more truly against it. . . . The barbarians being thus introduced as soldiers into the island, to encounter, as they falsely said, any dangers in defence of their hospitable entertainers, obtain an allowance of provisions, which, for some time being plentifully bestowed, stopped their doggish mouths. Yet they complain that their monthly supplies are not furnished in sufficient abundance, and they industriously aggravate each occasion of quarrel, saying that unless more liberality is shown them, they will break the treaty and plunder the whole island. In a short time they follow up their threats with deeds. After this, sometimes our countrymen, sometimes the enemy won the field, until the year of the siege of Bath-hill² (520?), which was (as I am sure) forty-four years and one month after the landing of the Saxons, and also the time of my own nativity.

[These Saxons and Jutes and Angles that came to Britain in 449 and later, came from what is today called Denmark, and from the southern shores of the North Sea west of Denmark. Taine's description, which follows, is famous.]

As you coast the North Sea from the Scheldt to Jutland, you will mark in the first place that the characteristic feature is the

¹ Yet the Saxon, the Teuton, was to make England the great empire she is.

² Probably Mount Badon, where the Celtic King Arthur won fame.

want of slope; marsh, waste, shoal; the rivers hardly drag themselves along, swollen and sluggish, with long, black-looking waves; the flooding stream oozes over the banks, and appears further on in stagnant pools.

The land produced after this fashion has one enemy, to wit, the sea. Holland maintains its existence only by virtue of its dykes. In 1654 those in Jutland burst, and fifteen thousand of the inhabitants were swallowed up. One need only see the blast of the North swirl down upon the low level of the soil, wan and ominous: the vast yellow sea³ dashes against the narrow belt of flat coast which seems incapable of a moment's resistance; the wind howls and bellows; the sea-mews cry; the poor little ships flee as fast as they can, bending almost to the gunwale, and endeavor to find a refuge in the mouth of the river, which seems as hostile as the sea. A sad and precarious existence, as it were face to face with a beast of prey. The Frisians, in their ancient laws speak already of the league they have made against "the ferocious ocean." Even in a calm this sea is unsafe.

Over the sea, flat on his face, lies the monstrous, terrible North wind.

Picture, in these marshes and forests, half-naked savages, a kind of wild beasts, fishers and hunters but especially hunters of men; these are they, Saxons, Angles, Jutes, Frisians; later on Danes, who during the fifth and the ninth centuries, with their swords and battle-axes, took and kept the island of Britain.

Huge white bodies, cool-blooded, with fierce blue eyes, reddish flaxen hair; ravenous stomachs filled with meat and cheese, heated by strong drinks; of a cold temperament, slow to love, home-stayers, prone to brutal drunkenness.

Amid the hardships and dangers of sea-faring life, they were pre-eminently adapted for endurance and enterprise, inured to misfortune, scorers of danger. They left the care of the land and flocks to the women and slaves; seafaring, war, and pillage was their whole idea of a freeman's work. They dashed to sea in their

³ Compare the two poems on "The North Sea," by Heine and Swinburne.

two-sailed barks, landed anywhere, killed everything; and having sacrificed in honor of their gods the tithe of their prisoners, and leaving behind them the red light of their burnings, went farther on to begin again. "Lord," says a certain litany, "deliver us from the fury of the Jutes." "Of all barbarians they are strongest of body and heart, the most formidable,"—we may add, the most cruelly ferocious.⁴

In the fifth century after the birth of Christ, the one country which we know to have borne the name of Angeln or Engleland lay in the district which we now call Sleswick, a district in the heart of the peninsula that parts the Baltic from the northern seas.

To the north of the English lay the tribe of Jutes, whose name is still preserved in their district of Jutland. To the south of them the tribe of the Saxons wandered over the sand-flats of Holstein, and along the marshes of Friesland and the Elbe.

The religion of the English was the same as that of the whole German family. Christianity, which had by this time brought about the conversion of the Roman Empire, had not penetrated as yet among the forests of the North. The common god of the English people, as of the whole German race, was Woden, whom every tribe held to be the first ancestor of its kings. Our own names for the days of the week still recall to us the gods whom our English fathers worshipped in their Sleswick homeland. Wednesday is Woden's day, as Thursday is the day of Thunder, or as the Northmen called him Thor, the god of air and storm and rain; Friday is Frea's day, the god of peace and joy and fruitfulness, whose emblems, borne aloft by dancing maidens, brought increase to every field and stall they visited. Saturday commemorates an obscure god Soetere; Tuesday the dark god, Tiw, to meet whom was death. Eostre, the goddess of the dawn, or of the spring, lends her name to the Christian festival of the resurrection. Behind these floated the dim shapes of an older mythology, "Wyrd," the death-goddess, whose memory lingered long in the "weird"

⁴ We leave Taine, here, and turn to Green's *Short History of the English People*.

of northern superstition, and "Nicor" the water sprite who gave us our water-nixies and "Old Nick."

The halt of the English conquerors after the battle of Mount Badon was no very long one, for even while Gildas was writing, the Britons seem to have been driven from the eastern coast by a series of battles whose history is lost. The invaders who thus became masters of the wolds of Lincolnshire, and of the great district which was cut off from the rest of Britain by the Wash and the Fens, were drawn from that tribe of the English, which bore especially the name of Englishmen, as those of South Britain had been drawn from its Saxon tribe, and those of Kent from its Jutish. On the coast the Angles were known as North-folk and South-folk, names still preserved to us in the counties where they settled. The district round London, on the other hand, was won and colonized by men of Saxon blood—the Middle-Sexe and East-Sexe or Essek.

THE COMING OF CHRISTIANITY FROM ROME

The marriage of Æthelberht, King of Kent, with Bercta, the daughter of the French king Charibert of Paris, created a tie between Kent and Gaul. But the union had far more important results than those of which Æthelberht may have dreamed. Bercta, like her Frankish kinsfolk, was a Christian. A Christian bishop accompanied her from Gaul to Canterbury, the royal city of Kent; and a ruined Christian church, the Church of St. Martin, was given them for their worship. The marriage of Bercta was an opportunity which was at once seized by the bishop who at this time occupied the Roman See, and who is justly known as Gregory the Great (Gregory I). Years before, when but a young deacon, Gregory had noted the white bodies, the fair faces, the golden hair of some youths who stood in the market-place of Rome. "From what country do these slaves come?" he asked the traders who brought them. "They are English, Angles," the slave-dealers answered. The deacon's pity veiled itself in poetic humor. "Not

Angles, but angels," he said, "with faces so angel-like! From what country come they?" "They come," said the merchants, "from Deira." "De ira! aye, plucked from God's ire, and called to Christ's mercy! And what is the name of their king?" "Ælla," they told him; and Gregory seized on the word as of good omen. "Alle-luia shall be sung there," he cried, and passed on, musing how the angel-faces should be brought to sing it. Years went by, and the deacon had become bishop of Rome, when Bercta's marriage gave him the opening he sought. He at once sent a Roman abbot, Augustine, at the head of a band of monks, to preach the Gospel to the English people. The missionaries landed in 597 on the very spot where Hengest had landed more than a century before in the Isle of Thanet; and the king received them sitting in the open air, on the chalk-down above Minster, where the eye now-a-days catches, miles away over the marshes, the dim tower of Canterbury. He listened to the long sermon as the interpreters whom Augustine had brought with him from Gaul translated it. "Your words are fair," Æthelberht replied at last, with English good sense, "but they are new and of doubtful meaning"; for himself, he said, he refused to forsake the gods of his fathers, but he promised shelter and protection to the strangers. The band of monks entered Canterbury bearing before them a silver cross with a picture of Christ, and singing in concert the strains of the litany of their church.

Canterbury became the centre of Latin influence. The Latin tongue became again one of the tongues of Britain, the language of its worship, its correspondence, its literature.

As yet these great results were still distant; a year passed before even Æthelberht yielded, but from the moment of his conversion the new faith advanced rapidly. The Kentish men crowded to baptism in thousands; the under-kings of Essex and East-Anglia received the creed of their over-lord.

Northumbria was now fast rising to power. Eadwine, who mounted the throne in 617, asserted like his predecessor his lordship over the English of Mid-Britain and was in fact supreme over

Britain as no king of English blood had been before. Northward his frontier reached the Forth, and was guarded by a city which bore his name, Edinburg, Eadwine's burg, the city of Eadwine. Westward, he was master of Chester, and the fleet he equipped there subdued the isles of Anglesey and Man. South of the Humber he was owned as over-lord by the whole English race save Kent: and Kent bound itself to him by giving him its king's daughter as a wife.

With the Kentish queen came Paulinus, one of Augustine's followers, whose tall stooping form, slender aquiline nose, and black hair falling round a thin worn face, were long remembered in the North; and the wise men of Northumbria gathered to deliberate on the new faith to which Paulinus and his queen soon converted Eadwine. Its charm lay in the light it threw on the darkness which encompasses men's lives. "So seems the life of man, O king," burst forth an aged Ealdorman, "as a sparrow's flight through the hall. The sparrow flies in at one door, and tarries for a moment in the light and heat of the hearth-fire, and then flying forth vanishes into the wintry darkness whence it came. So tarries for a moment the life of man in our sight, but what is before it, what after it, we know not. If this new teaching tells us aught certainly of these, let us follow it."

But the faith of Woden and Thunder was not to fall without a struggle. Even in Kent a reaction against the new creed began with the death of Æthelberht. The tide of reaction was checked for a time by Eadwine's conversion; until Mercia, under its king Penda, sprang into sudden greatness as the champion of the heathen gods. Paulinus had fled from Northumbria at Eadwine's fall; and the Roman Church in Kent shrank into inactivity before the heathen reaction. Its place in the conversion of England was taken by missionaries from Ireland.

THE COMING OF CHRISTIANITY FROM IRELAND

On a low island of barren gneiss-rock off the west coast of

Scotland an Irish refugee, Columba, had raised the famous monastery of Iona. Oswald in youth found refuge within its walls, and on his accession to the throne of Northumbria he called for missionaries from among its monks. The first despatched obtained little success, and declared success was impossible among a people so stubborn and barbarous. "Was it their stubbornness, or your severity?" asked Aidan, a brother sitting by; "did you forget God's word to give them the milk first and then the meat?" All eyes turned on the speaker as fittest to undertake the abandoned mission, and Aidan sailing at their bidding fixed his station in the island-peninsula of Lindisfarne. Thence, from the monastery which gave to the spot its after name of Holy Island, preachers poured forth over the heathen realms. Heathendom fought desperately for life. Penda was still its rallying point. His long reign was in fact one continuous battle with the Cross. Victory at last in 655 was declared for the faith of Christ.

The terrible struggle between heathendom and Christianity was followed by a long and profound peace. Northumbria soon saw the rise of a host of monasteries, not bound by the strict ties of the Benedictine rule, but gathered on the loose Celtic model of the family or the clan round some noble and wealthy person who sought devotional retirement.⁵

BEDE

No schools were more famous than those of Jarrow and York. The whole learning of the age seemed to be summed up in a Northumbrian scholar, Baeda—the Venerable Bede as later times styled him. The quiet grandeur of a life consecrated to knowledge, the tranquil pleasure that lies in learning and teaching and writing, dawned for Englishmen in the story of Baeda. While still young, he became teacher, and six hundred monks, besides strangers

⁵ Special topics may be found interesting on: Caedda (or St. Chad); Cuthbert; Caedmon, the first English poet; the council at Whitby in 664 which decided that England should be controlled by the church at Rome rather than the church in Ireland.

that flocked thither for instruction, formed his school of Jarrow. It is hard to imagine how among the toils of the schoolmaster and the duties of the monk, Baeda could have found time for the composition of the numerous works that made his name famous. "I am my own secretary," he writes; "I make my own notes. I am my own librarian." But forty-five works remained after his death to attest his prodigious industry. In treatises compiled as textbooks for his scholars, Baeda threw together all that the world had then accumulated in astronomy and meteorology, in physics and music, in philosophy, grammar, rhetoric, arithmetic, medicine. His last work was a translation into English of the Gospel of St. John. But the noblest proof of his love of England lies in the work which immortalizes his name. In his *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, Baeda was at once the founder of mediaeval history and the first English historian. All that we really know of the century and a half that follows the landing of Augustine, we know from him.

ENGLAND NOMINALLY UNITED UNDER EGBERT

All England south of the Thames had submitted to Ecgberht of Wessex. In 827 his army marched northward without a struggle; and Mercia bowed to the West-Saxon over-lordship. From Mercia, Ecgberht marched on Northumbria; its nobles met him at the Don with an acknowledgment of his over-lordship; and in right of an over-lordship which stretched from the Forth to the British Channel Ecgberht styled himself "King of the English."

THE COMING OF THE DANES

The Dane struck down the short-lived greatness of Wessex. Norway and its fellow Scandinavian kingdoms, Sweden and Denmark, were being brought at this time into more settled order by a series of great sovereigns, and the bolder spirits who would not submit to their rule were driven to the sea, and embraced a

life of piracy and war. Ecgberht had hardly brought all Britain under his sway when these Danes, as all the Northmen were at this time called, were seen hovering off the English coast, and growing in numbers and hardihood as they crept southward to the Thames. The first sight of the Danes is as if the hand on the dial of history had gone back three hundred years. The same Norwegian fiords, the same Frisian sandbanks, pour forth their pirate fleets as in the days of Hengest and Cerdic. There is the same wild panic as the black boats of the invaders strike inland along the river reaches, or moor round the river islets, the same sights of horror—firing of homesteads, slaughter of men, women driven off to slavery or shame, children tossed on pikes or sold in the market-place—as when the English invaders attacked Britain. Christian priests were again slain at the altar by worshippers of Woden, for the Danes were still heathen. Letters, arts, religion, governments disappeared before these Northmen as before the Northmen of old. The Danes were the same people in blood and speech with the people they attacked; they were in fact Englishmen bringing back to an England that had forgotten its origins the barbaric England of its pirate forefathers.

It was in the alliance of the Danes with the Britons that the danger of these earlier inroads lay. Ecgberht defeated the united forces of these two enemies in one victory; and his son Æthelwulf, who succeeded him in 838, drove them back again and again; and yet the danger grew greater year by year. But these earlier Danish forays had been mere preludes to the real Danish storm. When it burst in its full force upon the island, it was no longer a series of plunder-raids, but the invasion of Britain by a host of conquerors who settled as they conquered. The great abbeys of the Fen, Peterborough, Crowland, Ely, went up in flames, and their monks fled or were slain among the ruins. Mercia crouched in terror before the Danes, acknowledged them in 870 as its over-lords, and paid them tribute. In five years the work of Ecgberht had been undone, and England north of the Thames had been torn from the over-lordship of Wessex.

ALFRED THE GREAT

The Peace of Wedmore, the treaty made with the Danes in 878, at once marked the temper of Alfred, grandson of Ecgberht. Ardent warrior as he was, with a disorganized England before him, he set aside at thirty-one the dream of conquest to leave behind him the memory, not of victories but of good works, of daily toils by which he secured peace, good government, education for his people. His policy was one of peace. But the secret of his good government lay mainly in the intense energy of Ælfred himself. England still remained England; the Danes sank quietly into the mass of those around them; and Woden yielded without a struggle to Christ.

[Alfred is the only king of England to whom is given the title of Great. Note that in order to have peace he gave up two-thirds of his land to the heathen Danes. In doing this was he not more than one thousand years ahead of his time? Special topics should be looked up by the entire class on: the Danelagh; Alfred's translations; Alfred's writings; Alfred's work for the English language; the beginning of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; the rule over England of the Danish kings—Swegen, Cnut, Harthacnut; the Saxon Edward the Confessor; and possibly Earl Godwin and his son Harold.]

THE NORMANS

Rolf, the Ganger, or Walker, a pirate leader, had (in 911) wrested the land on either side of the mouth of the Seine from the French king, Charles the Simple. The treaty in which France purchased peace by this cession of the coast was a close imitation of the Peace of Wedmore. Rolf was baptized, received the king's daughter in marriage, and became his vassal for the territory which now took the name of "the Northman's land" or Normandy. But vassalage and the new faith sat alike lightly on the Dane. To the close of the century the whole people are still "Pirates" to the French around them, their land the "Pirates' land," their Duke the "Pirates' Duke."

Yet in the end the same forces which merged the Dane in the Englishman told even more powerfully on the Dane in France.

No race has ever shown a greater power of absorbing all the nobler characteristics of the peoples with whom they came in contact, or of infusing their own energy into them. Heathen Norman pirates became French Christians, and feudal at heart.

At the beginning⁶ of the eleventh century, Robert, called "the Magnificent," the fifth in succession from the great chieftain Rollo who had established the Northmen in France, was duke of Normandy. To the nickname he earned by his nobleness and liberality some chronicles have added another, and call him "Robert the Devil," by reason of his reckless and violent deeds of audacity, whether in private life or in warlike expeditions.

From 1035 to 1042, during the minority of William, son of Duke Robert, Normandy was a prey to robber-like ambition, the local quarrels, and the turbulent and brutal passions of a host of petty castle-holders, nearly always at war, either amongst themselves or with the young chieftain whose power they did not fear, and whose rights they disputed.

The day on which William for the first time donned his armor was, for his servants and all, a gala day. He was so tall, so manly in face, and so proud of bearing, that "it was a sight both pleasant and terrible to see him guiding his horse's career, flashing with his sword, gleaming with his shield, and threatening with his casque and javelins." His first act of government was a rigorous decree against such as should be guilty of murder, arson, and pillage; but he at the same time granted amnesty for past revolts, on condition of fealty and obedience for the future.

From the time of Rollo's settlement in Normandy, the communications of the Normans with England had become more and more frequent, and important for the two countries. The success of the invasions of the Danes in England in the tenth century, and the reigns of three kings of the Danish line, had obliged the princes of Saxon race to take refuge in Normandy. When at the death of the last Danish king Hardicanute, the Saxon prince Edward ascended the throne of his fathers, he had passed twenty-seven

⁶ We quote a few paragraphs here from Guizot's *History of France*.

years of exile in Normandy, and he returned to England "almost a stranger," in the words of the chronicles, to the country of his ancestors; far more Norman than Saxon in his manners, tastes, and language, and surrounded by Normans, whose numbers and prestige under his reign increased from day to day.

Duke William, on invitation, perhaps, from King Edward, paid a brilliant visit to England, where he found Normans everywhere established and powerful, in Church as well as in State; in command of fleets, ports, and principal English places. King Edward received him "as his own son, gave him arms, horses, hounds, and hawking-birds," and sent him home full of presents and hopes. The chronicler, Ingulf, who accompanied William on his return to Normandy, and remained attached to him as private secretary, affirms that, during this visit, not only was there no question, between King Edward and the duke of Normandy, of the latter's possible succession to the throne of England, but that never as yet had this probability occupied the attention of William.

It is very doubtful whether William had said nothing upon the subject to King Edward at that time; and it is certain, from William's own testimony, that he had for a long while been thinking about it.

At the news of Harold's accession,⁷ after a burst of furious passion, Duke William prepared to enforce his claim by arms. The difficulties in the way of his enterprise were indeed enormous. He could reckon on no support within England itself. At home he had to extort the consent of his own reluctant baronage; to gather a motley host and keep it together for months.

A general charge of the Norman foot opened the battle of Hastings, in 1066; in front rode the minstrel Taillefer, tossing his sword in the air and catching it again while he chanted the song of Roland. He was the first of the host who struck a blow, and he was the first to fall. . . . As the sun went down, a shaft pierced Harold's right eye; he fell between the royal ensigns, and the battle closed with a desperate *mêlée* over his corpse. While night

⁷ We return here to Green's *History of England*.

covered the flight of the English, the Conqueror pitched his tent on the very spot where his rival had fallen, and "sate down to eat and drink among the dead."

WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR RULES ENGLAND

London gave way at once; "they bowed to him," says the English annalist, pathetically, "for need." London was secured by the erection of a fortress which afterwards grew into the Tower, but William desired to reign not as a conqueror but as a lawful king. He received the crown at Westminster from the hands of Archbishop Ealdred, amidst shouts of "Yea, Yea," from his new English subjects.

As the conqueror of England, William introduced the military organization of feudalism, so far as was necessary for the secure possession of his conquests. The ground was already prepared for such an organization; we have seen the beginnings of English feudalism in the warriors, the "companions" or "thegns" who were personally attached to the King's warband, and received estates from the royal domain in reward for their personal service. But the tendency was quickened by the Conquest; the desperate and universal resistance of his English subjects forced William to hold by the sword what the sword had won, and an army strong enough to crush at any moment a national revolt was necessary for the preservation of his throne. Such an army could only be maintained by a vast confiscation of the soil. The poorest soldier of fortune found his part in the spoil. The meanest Norman rose to wealth and power in the new dominion of his Duke. Great or small, however, each estate thus held from the crown was held by its tenant on condition of military service at the royal call. Most manors, too, were burdened with their own "customs," or special dues to the crown, and it was for the purpose of ascertaining and recording these that William sent into each county the commissioners whose inquiries are preserved in the Domesday Book.

The fear of the Danes, which had so long hung like a thunder-cloud over England, passed away before the host which William, in 1085, gathered to meet a great armament assembled by King Canute (IV) of Denmark.

From⁸ the day of William the Conqueror, no man doubted that England was a realm which none could tear asunder. And from his day no man doubted where the headship of that realm lay, and that York was doomed to bow to Winchester and London.

The Norman Conquest is the great turning-point in the history of the English nation. Since the first settlement of the English in Britain, the introduction of Christianity is the only event which can compare with it in importance.

The Norman Conquest brought with it a most extensive foreign infusion, an infusion which affected our blood, our language, our laws, our arts. A kingdom which had hitherto been purely Teutonic was brought within the sphere of the laws, the manners, the speech, of the Romance nations.

[It should be emphasized that the Teutonic element, which was to make the English speaking nations what they are today, came into Britain, first with the *savage* Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, second with the *savage* Northmen or Danes, and third with the *civilized*, *Christianized*, and *Romanized* Normans, who looked down upon the English as barbarians. Pupils will enjoy Scott's *Ivanhoe*, which makes that point so clear.]

An increased intercourse of every kind with other European lands was an immediate result of the Conquest. Hitherto the commercial dealings of England had been almost wholly confined to the kindred land of Germany and Flanders. It must have made a vast change in the commerce of western Europe when the mouths of the Seine, the Loire, and the Garonne were in the hands of the same prince as the mouths of the Thames, the Severn, and the Humber.

The Norman Conquest had a great and lasting effect upon our language; it has, not in its immediate, but in its final results,

⁸ We quote from Freeman's famous and great work *The Norman Conquest*.

changed our vocabulary more largely than the vocabulary of any European language ever has been changed without being wholly displaced by another language.

With the actual Conquest came the settlement of the French-speaking King and his following of French-speaking Earls, Bishops, knights, clerks, and citizens. They spread themselves through every corner of the land, and took their place, instead of, or alongside of, Englishmen, in every rank above the villein. Nothing is plainer than that, from the very first, crowds of Englishmen must have found it needful to learn French, and crowds of Frenchmen must have found it expedient to learn English. The wonder is that for so long a time, the two languages went on side by side, almost untouched by one another's presence.

But for three hundred years English ceased to be a literary and courtly language. English had become a mere popular tongue, a vulgar tongue, the tongue which was the daily speech only of the less cultivated classes. The tongue of learning was Latin; the tongue of polite intercourse was French.

French words were constantly coming into the English; inflexions were constantly dropping off the English. During this time a very large part of the people of England must, like a large part of the people of Wales now, have habitually spoken two languages. One spoke French at his fireside and English only on occasion, while the other spoke English at his fireside and French only on occasion. It is plain then that, throughout the twelfth century, though French was the home-speech of the higher ranks and English the home-speech of the lower, there was at least nothing wonderful in a man of the highest rank being able to speak English, or in a man of the lowest rank being able to speak French, when so to speak was needful for either of them.

But things had changed between the twelfth century and the fourteenth. In the twelfth century the man of Norman descent spoke French naturally and habitually. He knew English only as an acquired tongue, to be spoken only when French would not serve. The English gentleman of the fourteenth century—his

Norman or Old-English descent now quite forgotten—spoke English naturally; but he was taught French from his childhood, because to speak French was the polite and fashionable thing. When it came to this, the victory of English was certain. French had lost all real hold on any class in the country; it was kept up by a mere fashion which might change at any moment. And in the later years of the fourteenth century the strife was decided. A name which all Englishmen ought to hold in honor is that of John Cornwell, master of grammar, who first began the change by which English boys were allowed to be taught in their own tongue and no longer in that of the stranger. If we ask for a particular date for the victory of English, we may take the year when English displaced French as the language of pleadings in the higher courts of law [1363].

[We must remember, however, that the English language had changed from that of Alfred's time: "Ohtthere saede his hlaforde, Aelfrede cyninge, haet he ealra Northmonna northmost bude. He cwaeth thaet he bude on thaem lande northweardum with tha Westsae," to that of Chaucer's time:

"Whan that Aprille with his shoures soote,
The droghte of Marche hath perced to the roote,
And bathed every veyne in swich licour,
Of which vertu engendred is the flour;"

The French that had come in was of course a modern form of the old Latin. The effect of the Norman Conquest on architecture and on literature can possibly be taken up in special topics.]

William the Conqueror takes his place alongside of those rulers of our own race whose lawful heir he claimed to be. He finished the work of Ecgberht; he preserved to us the laws of Ælfred. And with all this, he gave our land a European position which, if we had been left to ourselves could hardly have been our lot to win.

[We need spend almost no time on William the Conqueror's children—William Rufus, or the Red, who ruled from 1087 to 1100, Henry I from 1100 to 1135, and Adela. We return to Green.]

The vigorous administration of Henry the First completed in fullest detail the system of government which the Conqueror had

sketched. The vast estates which had fallen to the crown through forfeiture and revolt were granted out to new men dependent on royal favor; while the towns were raised into a counterbalancing force to the feudalism of the country by the grant of charters and the foundation of trade-guilds. The King's Court permanently represented the whole court of royal vassals, which had hitherto been summoned thrice in the year. As a court of justice it formed the highest court of appeal. As a financial body its chief work lay in the assessment and collection of the revenue. In this capacity it took the name of the Court of Exchequer, from the chequered table, much like a chessboard, at which it sat, and on which accounts were rendered. In their financial capacity its justices became "barons of the Exchequer."

From this work of internal reform Henry the First's attention was called suddenly, by one terrible loss, to the question of the succession to the throne. His son William was drowned.

Henry had no other son; but a daughter Matilda still remained to him. She had been married to the Emperor Henry the Fifth, but her husband's death now restored her to her father. He recognized her as his heir, though the succession of a woman seemed strange to the feudal baronage; nobles and priests were forced to swear allegiance to her as their future mistress, and Henry affianced her to the son of the one foe he really feared, the Count of Anjou. Her husband, Geoffrey the young Count of Anjou, from his habit of wearing the common broom of Anjou (the *planta genista*) in his helmet, had acquired, in addition to his surname of "The Handsome," the more famous title of "Plantagenet."

STEPHEN 1135-1154

"God give him," wrote the Archbishop of Rouen from Henry's death bed, "the peace he loved." With him indeed closed the long peace of the Norman rule. An outburst of anarchy followed on the news of his death, and in the midst of the turmoil Earl Stephen,

his nephew, appeared at the gates of London. Stephen was the son of the Conqueror's daughter, Adela, who had married a Count of Blois; he had been brought up at the English court, and his claim as nearest male heir was supported by his personal popularity. Mere swordsman as he was, his good humor, his generosity, his very prodigality made him a favorite with all. No noble however, had as yet ventured to join him, nor had any town opened its gates when London poured out to meet him with uproarious welcome. Neither baron nor prelate was present to constitute a National Council, but the great city did not hesitate to take their place. The voice of her citizens had long been accepted as representative of the popular assent in the election of a king; but it marks the progress of English independence under Henry that London now claimed of itself the right of election. Undismayed by the absence of the hereditary counsellors of the crown, its "aldermen and wise folk gathered together the folk mote, and these providing at their own will for the good of the realm, unanimously resolved to choose a king." The solemn deliberation ended in the choice of Stephen: the citizens swore to defend the King with money and blood, Stephen swore to apply his whole strength to the pacification and good government of the realm.

If London was true to her oath, Stephen was false to his. The twenty years of his reign are years of a misrule and disorder unknown in English history. Stephen had been acknowledged even by the partisans of Matilda, but his weakness and prodigality soon gave room to feudal revolt. The country was soon divided between the adherents of the two rivals, the West supporting Matilda, London and the East, Stephen. The war became a mere chaos of pillage and bloodshed. The outrages of the feudal baronage showed from what horrors the Norman rule had so long saved England. No more ghastly picture of a nation's misery has ever been painted than that which closes the English Chronicle, whose last accents falter out amidst the horrors of the time.

HENRY II

[Henry II, one of the greatest of English kings, was the first of the fourteen Plantagenets. The lands he inherited at his birth included besides England more of France than the French king ruled. Pupils should make maps showing just what Henry inherited and gained. His greatest work was his improvement of the law of England, too technical a question probably for pupils to go into at all thoroughly. The murder of Thomas a Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, may be given as a special topic.]

Henry II, the son of Matilda and Geoffrey, had by the death of his father become master of Normandy and Anjou, while by his marriage with its duchess, Eleanor of Poitou, he had added Aquitaine to his dominions.

He saw clearly, that the remedy for such anarchy as England had endured under Stephen lay in the establishment of a kingly government unembarrassed by any privileges of order or class, administered by royal servants, and in whose public administration the nobles acted simply as delegates of the sovereign. His work was to lie in the organization of judicial and administrative forms which realized this ideal.

It was in successive "Assizes," brief codes issued with the sanction of the great councils of barons and prelates he summoned year by year, that he perfected, by a system of reforms, the administrative measures which had begun with Henry the First. The fabric of English judicial legislation commences with the Assize of Clarendon, the first object of which was to provide for the order of the realm. No stranger might abide in any place save a borough, and there but for a single night, unless sureties were given for his good behaviour; and the list of such strangers was to be submitted to the itinerant justices. In the provisions of this assize for the repression of crime we find the origin of trial by jury, so often attributed to earlier times. Twelve lawful men of each hundred, with four from each township, were sworn to present those who were known or reputed as criminals within their district for trial by ordeal. The jurors were thus not merely witnesses, but sworn to act as judges also in determining the value of the

charge, and it is this double character of Henry's jurors that has descended to our "grand jury," who still remain charged with the duty of presenting criminals for trial after examination of witnesses against them. But for the fifty years which followed the Assize of Clarendon the trial of the accused, after the investigation of the grand jury, was found solely in the ordeal or "judgment of God," where innocence was proved by the power of holding hot iron in the hand, or by sinking when flung into the water, for swimming was a proof of guilt.

Henry restored the King's court and the occasional circuits of its justices: at the Council of Northampton he rendered this institution permanent and regular by dividing the kingdom into six districts, to each of which he assigned three itinerant justices. The circuits thus defined correspond roughly with those that exist at the present day [1874].⁹

Henry was now in appearance thoroughly master of his dominions. But the course of triumph and legislation was rudely broken by the quarrels and revolts of his sons. The successive deaths of Henry and Geoffrey were followed by intrigues between Richard, who had been entrusted with Aquitaine, and Philip, the King of France. The plot broke out at last in actual conflict; Richard did homage to Philip, and the allied forces suddenly appeared before Le Mans, from which Henry retreated in headlong flight towards Normandy. Death was upon him, and the longing of a dying man drew him to the home of his race. They gave him

⁹ The chief danger of the new system lay in the opportunities it afforded to judicial corruption; and so great were its abuses that Henry was soon forced to restrict for a time the number of justices to five—reserving appeals from their court to himself in council. It is from this Upper Court of Appeal, which he thus erected, that the judicial powers now exercised by the Privy Council of England are derived, as well as the equitable jurisdiction of the English Chancellor. In the next century it becomes the Great Council of the realm, from which the Privy Council drew its legislative, and the House of Lords its judicial character. The court of the Star Chamber and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council are later offshoots of Henry's Council. The King's Court, which became inferior to this higher jurisdiction, divided after the Great Charter into three distinct courts of the King's Bench, the Exchequer, and the Common Pleas, which by the close of the reign of Henry the Third received distinct judges, and became for all purposes separate. (Green's text.)

the list of conspirators against him: at the head of them was his youngest and best-loved son, John. "Now," he said, as he turned his face to the wall, "let things go as they will—I care no more for myself or for the world."

RICHARD THE LION HEARTED (COEUR DE LION 1190–1199).

We need not follow Richard in the Crusade which occupied the beginning of his reign, and which left England for four years without a ruler,—in his quarrels in Sicily, his conquest of Cyprus, his victory at Jaffa, his fruitless march upon Jerusalem, the truce he concluded with Saladin, his shipwreck as he returned, or his two imprisonments in Germany. Freed at last from his captivity, he found himself among dangers which he was too clear-sighted to undervalue. Less wary than his father, less ingenious in his political conceptions than John, Richard was far from a mere soldier. A love of adventure, a pride in sheer physical strength, here and there a romantic generosity, jostled roughly with the craft, the unscrupulousness, the violence of his race; but he was at heart a statesman, cool and patient in the execution of his plans as he was bold in their conception.

John, traitor to his brother as to his father, had joined Philip's alliance; while the Lords of Aquitaine also rose in revolt. Even Anjou, the home of Richard's race, drifted towards Philip as steadily as Poitou. England was drained by the tax for Richard's ransom, and irritated by his resumption, on his return, of all the sales by which he had raised funds for his Crusade. For some time he could do nothing but hold Philip in check on the Norman frontier, and reduce to submission the rebels of Aquitaine.

But the security of Normandy was requisite to the success of his plans, and Richard saw that its defence could no longer rest on the loyalty of the Norman people. The purely military site which Richard selected for the new fortress with which he guarded the border, showed his realization of the fact that Normandy could now only be held in a military way. As a monument of war-

like skill his "Saucy Castle," Château Gaillard, stands first among the fortresses of the middle ages. Even now, in its ruin, we can understand the triumphant outburst of its royal builder as he saw it rising against the sky: "How pretty a child is mine, this child of but one year old!"

Twelve months' hard work by securing the Norman frontier, set Richard free to deal his long-meditated blow at Philip. But in the midst of his threats an arrow struck him down. He died as he had lived, pardoning with kingly generosity the archer who had shot him.¹⁰

KING JOHN 1204-1215

The jealousy of province against province broke out fiercely at Richard's death. John was acknowledged as King in England and Normandy, while Anjou, Maine, and Touraine did homage to Arthur, the son of his elder brother Geoffrey, the late Duke of Brittany. A fresh outbreak of war was fatal to Arthur, who was taken prisoner to Rouen, and murdered there, as men believed by his uncle's hand. The brutal outrage at once roused Poitou in revolt; Anjou and Touraine welcomed Philip, and the French king marched straight on Normandy. The ease with which its conquest was effected is explained by the utter absence of any popular resistance on the part of the Normans themselves.

John's treasury was exhausted, and his mercenaries passed over to the foe. It was despair of any aid from Normandy that drove John over sea to seek it as fruitlessly from England.

"Foul as it is, hell itself is defiled by the fouler presence of John." The terrible verdict of the King's contemporaries has passed into the sober judgment of history. Externally John possessed all the quickness, the vivacity, the cleverness, the good-humor, the social charm which distinguished his house. He was fond of books and learned men. He had a strange gift of attracting friends and of winning the love of women. But in his inner soul

¹⁰ Some pupils, certainly, will enjoy Scott's *Ivanhoe* and *The Talisman*.

John was the worst outcome of the Angevins. He united into one mass of wickedness their insolence, their selfishness, their unbridled lust, their cruelty and tyranny, their shamelessness, their superstition, their cynical indifference to honor or truth. His ingratitude and perfidy had brought down his father's hairs with sorrow to the grave. To his brother he had been the worst of traitors. All Christendom believed him to be the murderer of his nephew, Arthur of Brittany. He had abandoned one wife and was faithless to another. His punishments were refinements of cruelty, the starvation of children, the crushing old men under copes of lead. But with the supreme wickedness of his race he inherited its profound ability. The closer study of John's history clears away the charges of sloth and incapacity with which men tried to explain the greatness of his fall. The awful lesson of his life rests on the fact that it was no weak and indolent voluptuary but the ablest and most ruthless of the Angevins who lost Normandy, became the vassal of the Pope,¹¹ and perished in a struggle of despair against English freedom.

Not only did John promise to receive Langton and to compensate the clergy for their losses, not only did he grovel at the feet of the exiled bishops on their return, but, amidst the wonder and disgust of his court, he solemnly resigned both crown and realms into the hands of the Pope's legate, and received them back again to be held by fealty and homage as a vassal of the Pope.

England thrilled at the news with a sense of national shame such as she had never felt before. "He has become the Pope's man," the whole country murmured; "he has forfeited the very name of King; from a free man he has degraded himself into a serf."

¹¹ The story in detail makes a good special topic. Briefly: at the death of an Archbishop of Canterbury (head of the Church of England) John appointed one of his own choosing, in place of the one chosen by the monks of Canterbury. Pope Innocent III, however, commanded the monks of Canterbury to elect Stephen Langton in place of either. England was put under an interdict, John was excommunicated and deposed. He was restored to kingship only after he had yielded England as a fief to the Pope.

John returned from a defeat at the hands of Philip to find the nobles no longer banded together in *secret* conspiracies, but *openly* united in a definite claim of liberty and law. The author of this great change was the new Archbishop whom Innocent had set on the throne of Canterbury. From the moment of his landing in England, Stephen Langton had assumed the constitutional position of the Primate as champion of the old English customs and law against the personal despotism of the kings.

The barons swore on the high altar to demand from John, if needful by force of arms, the observance of Henry the First's charter and of Edward the Confessor's Law. At Christmas they presented themselves in arms before the King, and preferred their claim. The few months that followed showed John that he stood alone in the land; nobles and Churchmen were alike arrayed against him. At Easter the barons again gathered in arms and renewed their claim. "Why do they not ask for my kingdom?" cried John in a burst of passion; but the whole country rose as one man at his refusal. London threw open her gates to the army of the barons. The example of the capital was at once followed by Exeter and Lincoln; promises of aid came from Scotland and Wales; the Northern nobles marched hastily to join their comrades in London. With seven horsemen in his train, John found himself face to face with a nation in arms. He had summoned mercenaries and appealed to his liege lord, the Pope; but summons and appeal were alike too late. Nursing wrath in his heart the tyrant bowed to necessity, and summoned the barons to a conference at Runnymede. The King encamped on one bank of the Thames, while the barons covered the marshy flat on the other, still known by the name of Runnymede. Their delegates met on the island between them, but the negotiations were a mere cloak to cover John's purpose of unconditional submission. The Great Charter was discussed, agreed to, and signed in a single day. (June 15, 1215). One copy of it still remains in the British Museum, injured by age and fire, but with the royal seal still hanging from the brown shrivelled parchment. It is impossible to gaze

without reverence on the earliest monument of English freedom which we can see and touch.

But in itself the Charter was no novelty, nor did it claim to establish any new constitutional principles. The Charter of Henry the First formed the basis of the whole, and the additions to it are for the most part formal recognitions of the judicial and administrative changes introduced by Henry the Second. "No freeman," ran the memorable article that lies at the base of our whole judicial system, "shall be seized or imprisoned, or dispossessed, or outlawed, or in any way brought to ruin: we will not go against any man nor send against him, save by legal judgment of his peers or by the law of the land." "To no man will we sell," runs another, "or deny, or delay, right or justice." The Court of Common Pleas was no longer to follow the King in his wanderings over the realm, but to sit in a fixed place. With the exception of the customary feudal aids which still remained to the crown, "no scutage or aid shall be imposed in our realm save by the common council of the realm." A council of twenty-four barons was chosen to enforce on John the observance of the Charter, with the right of declaring war on the king should its provisions be infringed.

"They have given me four-and-twenty over-kings," cried John in a burst of fury, flinging himself on the floor and gnawing sticks and straw in his impotent rage. But his death from a gluttonous debauch changed the whole face of affairs, for his son Henry was but a child of ten.

HENRY III 1216-1272

Henry the Third's conception of power lay, when he was of age, in the display of an empty and profuse magnificence. Frivolous, changeable, impulsive, false, childishly superstitious, we can trace but one strong political drift in Henry's mind, a longing to recover the Continental dominions of his predecessors, to surround himself like them with foreigners, and without any express break with the Charter to imitate the foreign character of their rule.

The whole machinery of administration passed into the hands of men ignorant and contemptuous of the principles of English government or English law. Their rule was a mere anarchy; the very retainers of the royal household turned robbers. That misgovernment of this kind should have gone on for twenty years unchecked, in defiance of the provisions of the Charter, was owing to the disunion and sluggishness of the English baronage.¹² In the long interval of misrule which followed, the financial straits of the King forced him to heap exaction on exaction. The Forest Laws were used as a means of extortion, sees and abbeys were kept vacant, loans were wrested from lords and prelates, the Court itself lived at free quarters wherever it moved. Supplies of this kind, however, were utterly insufficient to defray the cost of the King's prodigality. A sixth of the royal revenue was wasted in pensions to foreign favorites. The debts of the Crown mounted to four times its annual income. Henry was forced to appeal for aid to the great Council of the realm, and aid was granted on condition that the King confirm the Charter. The Charter was confirmed and steadily disregarded; and the resentment of the barons expressed itself in a determined protest and a refusal of further subsidies. In a few years Henry's necessities drove him to a new appeal, and the growing resolution of the nobles to enforce good government was seen in their offer of a grant on condition that the chief officers of the Crown be appointed by the great Council. Henry indignantly refused the offer, and sold his gold and silver plate to the merchants of London. From the Church he encountered as resolute an opposition. But the policy of John had made it easy to bridle the Church by the intervention of the Papacy, and at Henry's request a nuncio now appeared in the realm. The scourge of Papal taxation fell again on the clergy.

The story of this period of misrule has been preserved for us by Matthew Paris of St. Albans, the greatest, as he is in reality the last, of our monastic historians. The general fairness and

¹² There were some noble exceptions, of course. Special topics: Hubert de Burg; Rise of the Universities; Earl Marechal.

justice of his comments are only surpassed by the patriotic fire and enthusiasm of the whole. He had access to, and quotes largely from state documents, charters, and exchequer rolls. The frequency of the royal visits to the abbey brought him a store of political intelligence, and Henry himself contributed to the great chronicle which has preserved with so terrible a faithfulness the memory of his weakness and misgovernment.

SIMON DE MONTFORT

When a thunderstorm once forced Henry III, as he was rowing on the Thames, to take refuge at the palace of the Bishop of Durham, Earl Simon de Montfort, who was a guest of the prelate, met the royal barge with assurances that the storm was drifting away, and that there was nothing to fear. Henry's petulant wit broke out in his reply. "I fear thunder and lightning not a little, Lord Simon," said the King, "but I fear *you* more than all the thunder and lightning in the world."

The man whom Henry dreaded as the future champion of English freedom was himself a foreigner. But the one characteristic which overmastered all was what men at that time called his "constancy," the firm immovable resolve which trampled even death under foot in its loyalty to the right.

The tide of discontent, which was heightened by a grievous famine, burst its bounds when the King seized and sold corn which his brother had sent from Germany to relieve the general distress; and the barons repaired in arms to a Great Council summoned at Oxford. Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, now appeared at the head of the baronage, and demanded the appointment of a committee to draw up terms for the reformation of the state. Although half the committee consisted of royal ministers and favorites, it was impossible to resist the tide of popular feeling, and the new royal council named by it consisted wholly of adherents of the barons. In the Provisions of Oxford the Justiciary, Chancellor, and the guardians of the King's castles swore to act

only with the advice and assent of this Royal Council. Three Parliaments were to assemble every year, whether summoned by the King or no.

Resistance came only from the foreign favorites, and an armed demonstration drove them in flight over sea. The Council prohibited any further payments, secular or ecclesiastical, to Rome; and the negotiations conducted by Earl Simon with France, absolutely renounced Henry's title to his lost provinces.

The victory of Lewes¹³ placed Earl Simon at the head of the state. "Now England breathes in the hope of liberty," sang a poet of the time.

THE PARLIAMENT OF 1265

By the scheme devised in a parliament which immediately followed the battle of Lewes, the supreme power was to reside in the King, assisted by a council nominated by the Earls of Leicester and Gloucester and the patriotic Bishop of Chichester. In December a new parliament was summoned to Westminster, but the weakness of the patriotic party among the baronage was shown in the fact that only twenty-three earls and barons could be found to sit beside the hundred and twenty ecclesiastics. It was probably the sense of his weakness that forced Earl Simon to summon (in 1265) not only knights of the shires but two citizens from every borough. The attendance of delegates from the towns had long been usual in the county courts when any matter respecting their interests was in question; but it was the writ issued by Earl Simon that first summoned the merchant and the trader to sit beside the knight of the shire, the baron, and the bishop in the parliament of the realm.

EDWARD I 1272-1307

His father's death recalled Edward I from a crusade to meet at once the difficulty of Wales. During two years Llewelyn,

¹³ The royal party had resisted the Provisions of Oxford with war, but Earl Simon had won in the battle of Lewes.

Prince (really king) of Wales, rejected the King's repeated summons to him to perform his homage, till Edward's patience was exhausted, and the royal army marched into North Wales. The fabric of Welsh greatness fell at a single blow. With Llewelyn, the last ruler of Wales, expired the independence of his race. Edward established trade-guilds in the towns, introduced the English jurisprudence, divided the country into shires and hundreds on the English model, and abolished by the "Statute of Wales" the more barbarous of the Welsh customs. His policy of justice and conciliation accomplished its end, and with the exception of a single rising in Edward's reign the peace of Wales remained unbroken for a hundred years.

From the earliest moment of his reign Edward the First definitely abandoned all dreams of recovering the foreign dominions of his race, to concentrate himself on the consolidation and good government of Britain itself.

The number of the greater barons was diminishing every day, while the number of the country gentry and of the more substantial yeomanry was increasing with the increase of the national wealth. But while the number of those who actually possessed the privilege of assisting in Parliament was rapidly diminishing, the numbers and wealth of the "lesser baronage," whose right of attendance had become a mere constitutional tradition, was as rapidly increasing.

Time had, indeed, to pass, before the large and statesman-like conception of the great Simon de Montfort could meet with full acceptance. Through the earlier part of Edward's reign we find a few instances of the presence of representatives from the towns, but their scanty numbers and the irregularity of their attendance show that they were summoned rather to afford financial information to the Great Council than as representatives in it of an Estate of the Realm. But every year pleaded stronger and stronger for the Earl's conception, and in the Parliament of 1295 that of 1265 found itself at last reproduced.

It was difficult to suspect that a power before which the

Crown would have to bow lay in the ranks of soberly clad traders, summoned only to assess the contributions of their boroughs. The cost of their maintenance, the two shillings a day paid to the burgess by his town as four were paid to the knight by his county, was a burden from which the boroughs made desperate efforts to escape. During the whole time from the reign of Edward the Third to the reign of Henry the Sixth the sheriff of Lancashire declined to return the names of any boroughs at all within that county, "on account of their poverty." Nor were the representatives themselves more anxious to appear than their boroughs to send them. The busy country squire and the thrifty trader were equally reluctant to undergo the trouble and expense of a journey to Westminster. Legal measures were often necessary to ensure their presence. Writs still exist in abundance such as that by which Walter le Rous is "held to bail in eight oxen and four cart-horses to come before the King on the day specified" for attendance in Parliament. But in spite of obstacles such as these the presence of representatives from the boroughs may be regarded as continuous from the Parliament of 1295. By a change as silent within the Parliament itself we shall soon see the burgess, originally summoned to take part only in matters of taxation, admitted to a full share in the deliberations and authority of the other orders of the State.

In his own time, and amongst his own subjects, Edward was the object of almost boundless admiration. He was in the truest sense a national king. He is the first English king since the Conquest who loves his people with a personal love, and craves for their love back again.

[We omit Edward's effort to subdue Scotland. The Scottish heroes Robert I, the Bruce, and William Wallace are renowned in story and song.

We omit also the reign of Edward the First's son, Edward the Second 1307-1327, who was worthless and weak. Two points only need be remembered:

First: He married Isabella, daughter of the king of France. After her three brothers had in turn reigned as king of France and died leaving only daughters as heirs, her son, Edward III of England, claimed the French throne, and thus began the Hundred Years' War.

Second: Edward the Second's weakness resulted in such increased strength of Parliament that it finally deposed Edward II and had his son Edward the Third crowned in his stead. Some pupils may care to read Christopher Marlowe's *Edward the Second*. Special topic: The Guilds.]

EDWARD III 1327-1377

From the war with Scotland sprang the hundred years' struggle with France. At the fresh attack on Scotland which marked the opening of Edward's reign, the young King David of Scotland, found refuge in France, and arms, money, and men were despatched from its ports to support his cause. It was this intervention of France which foiled Edward's hopes of the submission of Scotland at the very moment when success seemed in his grasp.

THE HUNDRED YEARS' WAR

Cressy, 1346

The two weapons on which Edward counted were the wealth of England and his claim on the crown of France. It was with an army of thirty thousand men that he landed at La Hogue, and commenced a march northwards. He halted at the little village of Cressy and resolved to give battle. A small ditch protected the English front, and behind it the bowmen were drawn up "in the form of a harrow" with small bombards between them "which, with fire, threw little iron balls to frighten the horses"—the first instance of the use of artillery in field warfare. The battle went steadily against the French: at last Philip himself hurried from the field, and the defeat became a rout.

But the fall of France was hardly so sudden or so incomprehensible then as the fall of chivalry. The whole social and political fabric of the Middle Ages rested on a military base, and its base was suddenly withdrawn. From the day of Cressy feudalism tottered slowly but surely to its grave.

Calais, 1347

Edward aimed to save English commerce by securing the mastery of the Channel. Calais was the great pirate-haven; in one year alone, twenty-two privateers had sailed from its port; its capture promised the King an easy base also of communication with Flanders, and of operations against France. The siege lasted a year, and it was not till Philip had failed to relieve it that the town was starved into surrender.¹⁴ Edward was now "King of the Sea," but peace with France was as far off as ever.

[We omit the details of all the ensuing conflicts and sieges.]

Both parties were at last worn out. Edward's army had fallen back, ruined, on the Loire, when proposals of peace reached him. By the treaty of Bretigny, 1360 the English king waived his claims to the crown of France and to the Duchy of Normandy. On the other hand, his Duchy of Aquitaine, which included Gascony, Guienne, Poitou, and Saintonge, was left to him, no longer as a fief, but in full sovereignty, while his new conquest of Calais remained a part of the possessions of the English crown.

The Black Death (probably a bubonic plague) 1349

The most terrible plague which the world ever witnessed, after devastating Europe from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Baltic, swooped at the close of 1348 upon Britain. The traditions of its destructiveness, and the panic-struck words of the statutes which followed it, have been more than justified by modern research. Of the three or four millions who then formed the population of England, more than one-half were swept away in its repeated visitations. Its ravages were fiercest in the greater towns, where filthy and undrained streets afforded constant menace. In the burial ground which the piety of Sir Walter Manny purchased for the citizens of London, a spot whose site was afterwards marked by the Charter House, more than fifty thousand

¹⁴ Special topic: How the citizens of Calais were saved.

corpses are said to have been interred. Nearly sixty thousand people perished at Norwich, while in Bristol the living were hardly able to bury the dead. But the Black Death fell on the village almost as fiercely as on the town.

The whole organization of labor was thrown out of gear. Harvests rotted on the ground, and fields were left untilled, not merely from scarcity of hands, but from the strife which now for the first time revealed itself between Capital and Labor.

The outbreak of lawless self-indulgence which followed everywhere in the wake of the plague told especially upon the "landless men." The wandering laborer or artisan turned easily into the "sturdy beggar," or the bandit of the woods. A summary redress for these evils was found by the Parliament and the Crown in a royal ordinance which was later embodied in the Statute of Laborers, (1349). "Every man or woman" runs this famous Act, "of whatsoever condition, free or bond, able in body and within the age of three score years, . . . shall be bound to serve the employer who shall require him to do so, and shall take only the wages which were accustomed to be taken in the neighborhood where he is bound to serve two years before the plague began." Serner measures were soon found to be necessary. Not only was the price of labor fixed by the Parliament of 1350, but the labor class was once more tied to the soil. The laborer was forbidden to quit the parish where he lived in search of better-paid employment; if he disobeyed he became a "fugitive," and subject to imprisonment at the hands of the justices of the peace. The runaway laborer was at last ordered to be branded with a hot iron on the forehead.

The cry of the poor found a terrible utterance in the words of "a mad priest of Kent." "Mad" as the land owners called him, it was in the preaching of John Ball that England first listened to the knell of feudalism and the declaration of the rights of man. A spirit fatal to the whole system of the Middle Ages breathed in the popular rhyme which condensed the levelling doctrine of John Ball: "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?"

The rhyme was running from lip to lip when Edward the Third died in a dishonored old age and the accession of the child of the Black Prince, Richard the Second, (1377-1399), revived the hopes of the popular party.

Meanwhile the shame of defeat abroad was added to the misery and discord at home. The French war ran its disastrous course: one English fleet was beaten by the Spaniards, a second sunk by a storm; and a campaign in the heart of France ended, like its predecessors, in disappointment and ruin. It was to defray the cost of these failures that the Parliament granted (1379, 1380) a fresh subsidy, to be raised by means of a poll-tax on every person in the realm. To such a tax the poorest man contributed as large a sum as the wealthiest, and the gross injustice of such an exaction set England on fire from sea to sea.

The Peasant Revolt

The revolt spread like wildfire over the country: Norfolk and Suffolk, Cambridge and Hertfordshire rose in arms: from Sussex and Surrey the insurrection extended as far as Winchester and Somerset. But the strength of the rising lay in the Kentish-men, who were marching on London. The whole population joined them as they marched along, while the nobles were paralyzed with fear, and John of Gaunt, the Duke of Lancaster fled over the border, and took refuge in Scotland. The young King—he was but a boy of sixteen—found a mass of the peasants waiting for a conference with him outside of the city at Mile-End. “I am your King and Lord, good people,” the boy began with a fearlessness which marked his whole bearing throughout the crisis; “what will ye?” “We will that you free us for ever,” shouted the peasants, “us and our lands; and that we be never named nor held for serfs.” “I grant it,” replied Richard; and he bade them go home, pledging himself at once to issue charters of freedom and amnesty. A shout of joy welcomed the promise.

[But these promises did little or no good. Richard had no power; the land-owners considered their serfs to be their property. However, within sixty or seventy years serfdom had disappeared from England.

After Richard became older, as Green says: "the brilliant abilities which Richard shared with the rest of the Plantagenets were marred by a fitful inconstancy and a mean spirit of revenge." We cannot go into the history of the jealousies, hatreds, conspiracies and murders of the next hundred years. Through it all Parliament grew stronger and deposed and set up kings. Richard II was followed by three kings who were descendants of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster. They were: Henry IV 1399-1413, Henry V, 1413-1422, and Henry VI, 1422-1461. In Henry Fifth's reign, France suffered a terrible defeat at Agincourt (1415). Five years later the Treaty of Troyes gave Henry V, of England, the right of succession to the throne of France on the death of Charles the Sixth who was insane. However the French people rallied to the young Dauphin (who became Charles VII), refused to keep the treaty, and continued the war.]

Joan of Arc

The one pure figure which rises out of the greed, the lust, the selfishness, and unbelief of the time, is the figure of Joan of Arc.

Jeannette d'Arc was the child of a laborer of Domremy, a little village on the borders of Lorraine and Champagne. Her whole nature summed itself up in one absorbing passion: she "had pity" to use the phrase forever on her lip, "on the fair realm of France." As her passion grew she recalled old prophecies that a maid from the Lorraine border should save the land; she saw visions; St. Michael appeared to her in a flood of blinding light, and bade her go to the help of the King and restore to him his realm. "Messire," answered the girl, "I am but a poor maiden; I know not how to ride to the wars, or to lead men-at-arms." The archangel returned to give her courage, and to tell her of "the pity" that there was in heaven for the fair realm of France. The girl wept, and longed that the angels who appeared to her would carry her away, but her mission was clear. It was in vain that her father when he heard her purpose swore to drown her ere she should go to the field with men-at-arms. It was in vain that the priest, the wise people of the village, doubted and refused to aid her. "I must go to the King," persisted the peasant girl. "I had far rather rest and spin by my mother's side," she pleaded with touching pathos, "for this is no work of my choosing, but I must

go and do it, for my Lord wills it." "And who," they asked "is your Lord?" "He is God."

At the Court itself she found hesitation and doubt. The theologians proved from their books that they ought not to believe her. "There is more in God's book than in yours," Jeanne answered simply. At last the Dauphin received her in the midst of a throng of nobles and soldiers. "Gentle Dauphin," said the girl, "my name is Jehan the Maid. The Heavenly King sends me to tell you that you shall be anointed and crowned in the town of Rheims, and you shall be lieutenant of the Heavenly King who is the King of France.

The city of Orleans had already been driven by famine to offers of surrender when Jeanne appeared in the French Court. The success however of the handful of English besiegers depended wholly on the spell of terror which they had cast over France, and the appearance of Jeanne, at once broke the spell. As she mounted her charger, clad in white armor from head to foot, with the great white banner studded with fleur-de-lys waving over her head, she seemed "a thing wholly divine, whether to see or hear."

While the English remained panic-stricken around Paris, the army followed her through Troyes, growing in number as it advanced, till it reached the gates of Rheims. With the coronation of the Dauphin, the Maid felt her errand to be over. "O gentle King, the pleasure of God is done," she cried as she flung herself at the feet of Charles the Seventh and asked leave to go home. "Would it were His pleasure that I might go and keep sheep once more with my sisters and my brothers: they would be so glad to see me again!"

The English, however, had now received reinforcements. During the defence of Compiègne she fell into the hands of the Duke of Vendome, to be sold by her captor into the hands of the Duke of Burgundy, and by the Duke into the hands of the English. To the English her triumphs were victories of sorcery, and after a year's imprisonment she was brought to trial on a charge of heresy before an ecclesiastical court. On the charge of sorcery and diabolical possession she still appealed firmly to God. "I

hold to my Judge," she said, as her earthly judges gave sentence against her, "to the King of Heaven and Earth."

A great pile was raised in the market-place of Rouen where her statue stands now. Even the brutal soldiers who snatched the hated "witch" from the hands of the clergy and hurried her to her doom were hushed as she reached the stake. One indeed passed to her a rough cross he had made from a stick, and she clasped it to her bosom. "Yes! my voices were of God!" she suddenly cried as the last moment came; "they have never deceived me!" Soon the flames reached her, the girl's head sank on her breast, there was one cry of "Jesus!" "We are lost," an English soldier muttered as the crowd broke up, "we have burned a Saint." (May 30, 1431.)

In two months from the resumption of the war half Normandy was in the hands of the French. The surrender of fortress after fortress secured the final expulsion of the English from the soil of France. (1451). The Hundred Years' war had ended, not only in the loss of the temporary conquests made since the time of Edward the Third, with the exception of Calais, but in the loss of the great southern province of Guienne, and in the building up of France into a far greater power than it had ever been before.

[We omit all the details of the Wars of the Roses (1455-1485). As Green says: "There are few periods in our annals from which we turn with such weariness and disgust as from the Wars of the Roses. Its thick crowd of savage battles, its ruthless executions, its shameless treasons seem all the more terrible from the pure selfishness of the ends for which men fought, the utter want of all nobleness and chivalry in the struggle itself, of all great result in its close."

The weakness and periodic imbecility of Henry VI, last of the House of Lancaster (whose badge was the red rose) caused—among the descendants of the Duke of York, brother of the Duke of Lancaster—conspiracies to seize the crown. The badge of the House of York was the white rose. Henry VI finally fled, and was murdered, probably by Richard the III, of York; Edward IV, 1461-1483, of the House of York was made King; Edward V, of York, 1483, was murdered in the Tower, probably by Richard III; Richard III King of England from 1483 to 1485 was finally killed in the battle of Bosworth Field, 1485.

With the death of all male descendants of the Houses of Lancaster and York, the crown of England went to Henry, the son of Margaret of Lancaster and Edmund Tudor. He became in 1485 Henry VII, the first Tudor King. By his marriage with Elizabeth of York he united the two Houses.]

XX—THE RENAISSANCE IN EUROPE

[We return now to the history of continental Europe and begin the study of the Renaissance (rebirth or re-awakening) of Europe.

First, let us glance at the conditions which cause us to speak of the *darkness* or night of the Middle Ages, from which the Renaissance was the awakening.

Pupils should review in special topics what they already know about the evil conditions in feudalism, in the church, in banditry, in travel, in medicine, and in superstitions. We quote a few paragraphs from Hallam's great work *A View of the State of Europe During the Middle Ages*.]

It is not possible to fix accurate limits to the Middle Ages: but the ten centuries from the fifth to the fifteenth seem, in a general point of view, to constitute that period.

No circumstance is so prominent on the first survey of society during the earlier centuries of this period, as the depth of ignorance in which it was immersed. For many centuries, to sum up the account of ignorance in a word, it was rare for a layman, of whatever rank, to know how to sign his name. Their charters, till the use of seals became general, were subscribed with the mark of a cross. Still more extraordinary it was to find one who had any tincture of learning. Even admitting every indistinct commendation of a monkish biographer (with whom a knowledge of church-music would pass for literature) we could make out a very short list of scholars.

This universal ignorance was rendered unavoidable, among other causes, by the scarcity of books, which could only be procured at an immense price. From the conquest of Alexandria by the Saracens at the beginning of the seventh century, when the Egyptian papyrus almost ceased to be imported into Europe, to the close of the tenth, about which time the art of making paper from cotton rags seems to have been introduced, there were no materials for writing except parchment, a substance too expensive to be readily spared for mere purposes of literature. Hence an unfortunate practice gained ground, of erasing a manuscript in order to substitute another on the same skin. This occasioned the loss of many ancient writings.

¹ See Jusserand's *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*.

In the shadows of this universal ignorance, a thousand superstitions, like foul animals of night, were propagated and nourished. The real character of those times is only to be judged by their accumulated multitude. There are many books from which a sufficient number of instances may be collected.

From Caxton's *Mirroure of the World*²:

"And emonge alle other this present booke, whiche is called the ymage or myrroure of the world, ought to be visyted, redde & knowen, by cause it treateth of the world and of the wondreful dyuision thereof. In whiche book a man resonable may see and vndrrstande more clerer, by the visytyng and seeyng of it and the figures therin, the situacion and moeuyng of the firmament, and how the vnyuersal erthe hangeth in the myddle of the same, as the chapitres here folowyng shal more clerly shewe and declare to yon....

Affter³ comen the contrees of Yndes whiche take their name of a water that is called Ynde, which sourdeth in the north. The Yndes ben closed with the Grete See that enuyronneth them round aboute.

In Ynde is an yle named Probane [Ceylon?], wherin ben founded ten cytees and plente of other townes, where as euery yere ben two somers & two wynters; and ben so attemprid that there is alway verdure, and vpon the trees ben contynuelly flowres, leeuys and fruyt. And it is moche plenteuous of gold and syluer, and moche fertyle of other thynges.

There be the grete montaynes of gold and of precyous stones and of other riches plente. But no-man dar approche it for the dragons and for the gryffons wylde whiche haue bodyes of lyouns fleyng, which easily bere a man away armed and syttyng vpon his hors, whan he may sease hym with his clawes and vgnles.

Ther ben yet plente of other places so delectable, so swete and so spyrytuel that, yf a man were therin, he shold saye that it were a very paradys....

There is in the lande of Ynde a right grete montayne that men calle mount Capien, and it is a moche grete regyon. Ther ben

² According to Caxton the *Mirroure* was translated in 1480 from a French version of a work composed perhaps in 1245. People then probably considered it a sort of encyclopaedia.

³ The four quarters of the earth, the limits of Europe and Africa and the Earthly Paradise and four streams of Paradise have been described.

a maner of people without wytte & without discrecion, whiche the kyng Alysaundre enclosed therin. And ben named Goths and Magoths, or Gog or Magog. They ete flessh all rawe, be it men or wymmen or bestes, as men wood, mad or demonyacks.

This Ynde of whiche I you reherce conteyneth xiiii Regyons, and in euerich of thise regyons ben moche peple.

And also ther is therin grete trees and so hye that they towche the cloudes. And there dwelleth peple that ben horned, and ar but ii cubites hye. And they goon to gydre in grete compaynes; ffor ofte they fighte ayenst the Cranes whiche them assaylle. But within vii yere they become aged and olde that they deye for age. This peple is callyd Pygmans, & ben as lytil as dwarfes.

Ryght nygh vnto this contree groweth pepre alle whytte, But the vermyne is there so grete that, whan they wold gadre and take it, they muste sette fyre therin for to dryue away the vermyne; and whan it is so brent, the pepre is founden al blacke scorchid and cryspe. . . .

In this contrees is grete nombre of bestes right dredful and terryble, whiche haue bodyes of men and heedes of dogges; and haue so grete uncles or clawes that arreste alle that they can holde; and clothe them with the hydes and skynnes of bestes; and haue suche maner of voys as barkyng of dogges.

Yet ben ther other called Cylopyens whiche passe by rennyng the wynde; & have only but one fote of whiche the plante [tread or sole] is so right longe and so brode that they couere them therewith fro the shadow whan the hete cometh ouer sharp on them.

Another maner peple ther is whiche haue only but one eye, and that standeth right in the myddys of the fronte or forhede, whiche is so reed and so clere that it semeth properly fyre brennyng.

And there also ben founde another maner of peple that haue the visage and the mouth in the myddle of their breste, and haue one eye in euery sholdre. . . .

Another beste there is that men calle Salemandre, whiche is fedde and nouryssed in the fyre. This Salemandre berith wulle of whiche is made cloth and gyrdles that may not brenne in the fyre.

There ben yet myes the whiche ben as grete as cattes & also swyft in rennyng. . . .

There ben plente of . . . serpents that haue many precyous stones in the heedes and in the eyen, the which ben of right grete vertue for them that myght haue them and bere them.

And the Regyon of Ffenyce is there, whiche taketh his name of a byrde callyd ffenyx of whiche in alle the world is on this day but only one a lyue; and whan he deyeth, anone groweth another of hym self. He is grete and moche fair of Corsage, and hath a creste on his heed, lyke as the pecok hath. The breste and the gorge of hym shyneth and draweth toward the propre colour of fyn golde. And he is alonge on the back also reed as a rose. And toward the tayll he is of the colour of Asure, lyke vnto the heuen whan it is pure and clere. And whan he is olde and eaged, he withdraweth him vnto an hye and meruayllous fair place or montaygne, where as sourdeth a fontayne right grete and large, and the water fair and clere. And ouer the welle groweth a fair tree and grete, whiche may be seen fro ferre. And he maketh vpon this tree his neste and his sepulture right in the myddle of the tree. But he maketh it of spices of so right grete odour that ther may be founden no better. And after he adressyth hym in his neste whan he hath all perfourmed it; he thenne begynneth to meue and to bete his wynges ayenst the sonne so faste and so longe that a grete hete cometh in his fethers, in suche wyse that it quykeneth of fyre and brenneth al rounde aboute his body that he is on a clere fyre. And thus the fyre brenneth and consumeth hym alle in to asshes; and out of thise asshes and pouldre groweth agayn another byrde alle lyuyng semblable to hym. . . .

Virgyle, the wyse philosophre born in Itaille, was to fore the comyng of Our Lord Jhesu Cryst. He sette not lytil by the vii sciences, ffor he trauaylled and studyed in them the most part of his tyme, somoche that by astronomye he made many grete meruaylles.

FFor he made in Naples a flye of copper whiche, whan he had sette it vp in a place, that flye enchaced and hunted away alle other flyes, so that ther myght abyde none in ony place ne durste none approche nyghe to that flye by the space of two bowe shote round aboute. And yf ony flye passed the bounde that Virgyle had compassed, incontynent it shold deye, and myght no lenger lyue.

He made also an hors of brasse, the whiche guarisshed and heled alle horses of all their maladyes and seknesses of whiche they were entechid, also sone as the seke hors loked on the hors of brasse.

Also he founded a meruayllous cyte vpon an egge by suche force and power that, whan the egge was meuyd, all the cyte quaued and shoke. And the more the egge was meuyd the more

the cyte quaued and trembled. The cyte in hye and lowe and in playn, the flye of copper and hors of brasse that Virgyle thus made, ben in Naples, and the cage where the egge is in, alle ben there seen. This hath be said to vs of them that be comen fro thens and that many tymes haue seen them....

Yet made he an heed to speke, which answerd of alle that whiche he was demanded of, and of that whiche shold happen and come in therthe. So on a day he demanded of the heed how he shold doo in a certayn werke where as he shold goo vnto. But the heed answered to hym in suche wyse that he vnderstode it not wel; ffor hit sayde that yf he kept wel the heed, he shold come agayn all hole. And with this answeere he wente his way well assured. But the Sonne, whiche that day gaf grete hete, smote hym on the heed and chauffed his brayn, of whiche he toke none hede, that he gate therby a sekenes and maladye whereof he deyde. Ffor whan he had the answeere of the heed, he vnderstode not that he spack of his heed, but vnderstode of the heed that spack to hym; but it had be better that he had kept wel his owne heed....

Now wyll I recounthe to you briefly of the sterres of the firmament, of whiche ther is a right grete nombre; and they ben alle of one lyke heyghte, but they ben not all of one gretenes.... But ther is none of them so grete ne so shynyng as is the Sonne; ffor he enlumyneth alle the other by his beaulte whiche is so moche noble.

Ffro therthe vnto the heuen, wherin the sterres ben sette, is a moche grete espace; ffor it is ten thousand and lv sythes as moche, and more, as is alle therthe of thycknes. And who that coude acompte after the nombre and fourme, he myght knowe how many ynches it is of the honde of a man, and how many feet, how many myles, and how many Journeyes it is from hens to the firmament or heuen. Ffor it is as moche way vnto the heuen as yf a may [man?] myght goo the right way without lettyng [hindrancel], and that he myght goo euery day xxv myles of Fraunce, whiche is l englissh myle, and that he taried not on the waye, yet shold he goo the tyme of seuen M. i. C. and lvii [7157?] yere and an half er he had goon somoche waye as fro hens vnto the heuen where the sterres be inne....

From *The Book of Quinte Essence, or Fifth Being, That is to say Man's Heaven*⁴:

With *the* might, wisdom, & grace of *the* holy trynite, I write to you a tretice in english breuely drawe out of *the* book of quintis essencijs in latyn, *that* hermys *the* prophete and kyng of Egipt after the flood of Noe, fadir of philosophris, hadde by reuelacioun of an aungil of god to him sende, *that the* wijsdom and *the* science of *this* book schulde not perische, but be kept and preserued vnto *the* eende of *the* world, of alle holy men from al wickid peple and tyrauntis, for greet perilis *that* myghte falle *therof*. . . .

The science to make a fier, *that* is, without cole, withoute lyme, withoute light, worchinge aghens al maner sharpnes or accioun of visible fier, right as worchith *the* fier of helle. And *this* priuytee [secret] is so vertuous, *that the* vertu *therof* may not all be declarid. And *thus* it is maad. Take Mercurie *that* is syblymed [sublimated] with vitriol, & comen salt, & sal armoniac 7 or 10 tymes sublymed and meynge hem togidere by euene porcioun, and grynde it smal, and leye it abrood vpon a marbil stoon; and by nyghte sette it in a soft cleer eir, or ellis in a coold seler; and *there* it wole turne into watir. And *thanne* gadere it togidere in to a strong vessel of glas, and kepe it. This water forsothe is so strong, *that* if a litil drope *therof* falle vpon youre hond, anon it wole perce it thorough-out; and in *the* same manner it wole do, if it falle vpon a plate of venus [copper] or Iubiter [tin], into *this* watir, it turneth hem into lijknes of peerl. who so coude reparale & prepare kyndely *this* fier, without doute it wolde quenche anon a brennyng sijknese clepid *the* fier of helle. And also it wolde heele euery cor [os] if sijknese. And manye philosophoris clepith *this* thing in her bookis 'sal amarus,' al though *thei* teche not *the* maistrie *therof*. If it be so *that this* fry watir breke *the* glas, and renne out into *the* aischen, *thanne* gadere alle togidere *that* ye fynde pastid in the aischen; and leye it vpon a marbil stoon as afore, and it wole turne into watir And *this* is a great priuytee. . . .

And manye philosophoris clepith *this* quinta essencia an oile incombustible. *that* is a greet priuytee. And if ye wole fixe *this* quinta essencia in oure heuene, *that* it may withoute doute restore aghen to man *that* nature *that* is lost, and reduce him aghen into *the* vertu of *the* strenkthe of yongthe, and also lenkthith his lijf into *the* laste terme of lijf set of god. . . .

⁴ Copied from the edition of Dr. Frederick J. Furnivall of the Sloane manuscript of about 1460-1470. (Published by the Early English Text Society, 1866.)

Here bigynneth the secunde book of medicyns. The first medicyn is to reduce an oold feble euangelik man to *the* first strenk*the* of yong*the*. Also to restore aghen his nature *that* is lost, and to lenk*the* his lijf in greet gladnesse and perfig*the* heele vnto *the* laste teerme of his lijf *that* is sett of god. Ye schal take oure 5 ta essencie aforesaid, that is to seye, mannys heuene, and *therinne* putte a litil quantite of 5 essencia of gold and of peerl. and *the* oolde feble man schal vse *this* deuyn drynk at morn and at euen, ech tyme a walnote-schelle fulle and *withinne* a fewe dayes he schal [be] so hool *that* he schal fele him silf of *the* statt and *the* strenk*the* of xl yeer; and he schal haue greet ioie *that* he is come to *the* statt of yong*the*. And whanne his yong*the* is recouerid, and his nature restorid, and heel*the* had, it is nedeful *that* litil and seelde he vse 5 essence. Also it is nedeful *that* he vse ofte good wiyn at his mete and at *the* soper, in *the* which he fixid *the* 5 essence of gold, as I taughte you tofore. . . .

Part of a lesson given in the School of the Palace of Charlemagne by Alcuin to Pepin, second son of Charlemagne, a boy then fifteen or sixteen:⁵

"Pepin. What is writing?

Alcuin. The keeping of history.

P. What is speaking?

A. The interpreter of the soul.

P. What is it gives birth to speaking?

A. The tongue.

P. What is the tongue?

A. The whip of the air.

P. What is the air?

A. The preserver of life.

P. What is life?

A. Happiness for the happy, misery for the miserable; the expectation of death.

P. What is death?

A. An inevitable event, a doubtful journey, a subject of tears for the living, the confirmation of wills, the robber of men.

P. What is man?

A. The slave of death, a passing traveller, a guest in his own abode.

P. How is man placed?

A. As a traveller exposed to the world.

⁵ As quoted by Guizot in his *History of Civilization*.

P. Where is he placed?

A. Between six walls.

P. What are they?

A. That above, that below, that on the right, that on the left, that in front, that behind.

SCHOLASTICISM

It was a long time⁶ before the people of the Middle Ages, imbued as they were with the most profound faith, asked of others than their theologians the solution of those great problems concerning the nature of the soul and of God, which have always occupied the human mind. A questioning spirit was, however, finally awakened, and from that moment philosophy, which had been dead for six centuries, reappeared, but under a peculiar form, which procured it the special name of Scholasticism. . . .

All science was reduced to the art of reasoning, and every regularly formed syllogism carried conviction with it regardless of the premises on which it rested.⁷ Hence scholasticism was not a definite system of philosophy, that is, an organized body of doctrines on the great questions which interest us all; it was rather a certain method of discussing all questions, starting from premises which were either adopted ready-made or assumed without attempting first to verify their truth. Hence no idea of any importance to the world was gained from this system; and it remained a sort of intellectual gymnastics in which the reward was not the discovery of any truth, but a victory gained in a combat of words,

⁶ We quote from Victor Duruy's *History of the Middle Ages* by kind permission of Henry Holt and Company.

⁷ A syllogism is made up of three statements, a major premise (statement) a minor premise, and the conclusion. An error in a syllogism is called a fallacy. An example of a faulty syllogism is:

Major premise: No cat has nine tails.

Minor premise: One cat has one more tail than no cat.

Conclusion: Therefore one cat has ten tails.

Some of the questions which were lengthily and learnedly discussed were: "If spirits do not occupy space, how many angels could stand on the tip of a needle?" "If a donkey were placed exactly half way between two stacks of hay so that the attraction from both sides would be equal, would he starve?"

aided by subtle and ridiculous distinctions and by a barbarous language which was only comprehensible to the initiated. Much time and energy was lost in these disputes; nevertheless, the mind was sharpened and strengthened by these struggles, and was prepared for more serious studies.

During the thirteenth century long debates were carried on between the Scotchman, Duns Scotus, and the Italian, Saint Thomas Aquinas, both of whom studied and taught at Paris with the greatest success, dividing between them the school, and all Christendom, and continuing to agitate the fourteenth century by the disputes of their partisans, the Scotists and the Thomists. St. Thomas Aquinas was the most perfect expression of idealism in scholasticism. His *Summa Theologiae*, though left unfinished, is a great work, in which he proposed to record all that was known of the relations between God and man. These men had been preceded in the school of Paris by the German, Albert the Great, who was afterwards the bishop of Ratisbon, and whose wisdom gave him the reputation of being a magician, and by the Englishman Alexander of Hales, "the irrefragable doctor," and the oracle of the Franciscans.

After these great men, we must at least mention Vincent of Beauvais, chaplain of St. Louis, if not for his intellectual power at least for the interest afforded us by his encyclopedia of the learning of his times, his *Speculum majus*, which recalls Pliny's work on the learning of antiquity. We must, however, hasten to say that until the thirteenth century, the Middle Ages had lived upon the remains of the knowledge of antiquity without having added to it in any way. Albert the Great was the first to return to the method of observation in the study of physical nature, but no invention was made until the Englishman, Roger Bacon, (1214-1294) a Franciscan monk who also studied at Paris, discovered or at least explained in his writings the composition of gunpowder, and the construction of the magnifying glass and of the air-pump. He perceived the necessity of making over the calendar, and the changes he proposed are precisely the same as those

adopted under Gregory XIII. There was something both of Kepler and of Descartes in the monk who dared write: "We have three means of knowledge,—first, authority, which by enforcing opinions on the mind without enlightening it, induces belief but not comprehension; second, reasoning, by which we cannot distinguish a sophism from a demonstration except by verifying the conclusion by experience and practice; and third, experience, which is the end of all speculation and the queen of the sciences, since it alone can verify and crown their results." It is not surprising that, in spite of his sincere faith, this pioneer suffered the same fate as all those who are in advance of their age. Bacon spent twenty four years of his life either in the prisons of his order or under persecution: he died about 1294....

One of the fancies of this age was astrology, and it continued to be studied until the sixteenth century, and did not become entirely extinct until the seventeenth. The astrologers pretended to read the destinies of human life in the stars.⁸ Another folly was that of the alchemist who sought after the philosopher's stone, that is, the means of making gold by the transmutation of metals. Though they had such a fantastic end in view, these researches led to some fortunate discoveries.⁹ Some astrologers, by dint of gazing at the sky, finally began to look there for the laws regulating the movement of the stars; the alchemists did not find gold in their

⁸ Compare Chaucer's Doctor.

⁹ (Duruy's note.) The alchemists believed that minerals were endowed with life in the same way that vegetables are, and that they were continually developing in the ground by means of new combinations of their constituent elements, and changing from the least perfect to the most perfect state, being all converging toward gold, which was pre-eminently *the* metal. From these false premises they argued logically enough that this work of nature could be helped on, and that science would be able to find a means for the transmutation of metals, as soon as the substance necessary to accomplish this phenomenon, the philosopher's stone, should have been found. The great elixir which was going to bring its finder gold, diamonds, and even the health and length of days of Methuselah, could never be found, but we owe to the alchemists the first descriptions of our ordinary metals and of the principal compositions in use in their laboratories and pharmacies: of antimony, bismuth, volatile alkali, and many compositions into which mercury enters; oxygen, phosphorus, zinc, the mineral and vegetable colors; the purification and testing of the precious metals, and the introduction of metallic medicaments into the practice of medicine.

crucibles, but they found new substances, or discovered some new property of the substances already known. In this way the distillation of salts, the strong acids, the art of enameling, and of making the convex glasses from which spectacles are made, were all discovered. We have already spoken of gunpowder, which was known to the Arabs, and of the compass, which was, perhaps transmitted to us by them from China.

[We have seen some of the elements of the darkness, or night, of the Middle Ages. Now we shall look at some of the causes that led to the re-awakening or rebirth, Renaissance, of Europe. First come the Crusades.]

THE CRUSADES, OR WARS OF THE CROSS¹⁰

From the earliest ages of the Church, a custom had been practised of making pilgrimages to the Holy Land.

But the armed doctrine of Mahomet invaded, within a very short period, the three Arabias, a part of Syria, and a large division of Persia. Amidst the first conquests of the Saracens, they had turned their eyes towards Jerusalem. According to the faith of the Mussulmans, Mahomet had been in the city of David and Solomon; it was from Jerusalem that he set out to ascend into heaven in his nocturnal voyage. The Saracens considered Jerusalem as the house of God, as the city of saints and miracles. A short time after the death of the Prophet, the soldiers of Omar besieged it. Jerusalem at length surrendered to the caliph Omar, who himself came into Palestine to receive the keys and the submission of the conquered city. [637 A. D.]

Under the reign of Haroun al Raschid the glory of Charlemagne, which had reached Asia, protected the churches of the East. His pious liberality relieved the indigence of the Christians of Alexandria, of Carthage, and Jerusalem.

¹⁰ From J. F. Michaud's *History of the Crusades* (1840). It is only fair to say that although Joseph Francois Michaud was a learned and careful French historian, his six volume history of the Crusades is said today to be, "more interesting than exact."

However, Hakim, the third of the Fatimite caliphs, signalized his reign by all the excesses of fanaticism and outrage.¹¹ The blood of the Christians flowed in all the cities of Egypt and Syria, their courage in the midst of torments only adding to the hatred of their persecutors.

The calamities of the holy city rendered it still more venerable in the eyes of the faithful; persecution redoubled the pious delirium of those who went into Asia to contemplate a city covered with ruins, and to behold an empty sepulchre.

At this period, a prediction, which announced the end of the world and the approaching coming of Jesus Christ into Palestine, very much increased the veneration of the people for the holy places. The Christians of the West arrived in crowds at Jerusalem, with the design of dying there, or there awaiting the coming of the sovereign judge. The monk Glaber informs us, that the affluence of pilgrims surpassed all that could be expected from the devotion of these remote times. First were seen on the holy march the poor and the lower classes, then counts, barons, and princes, all reckoning as nothing the grandeurs of the earth.

Such were the devotion and spirit of the tenth and eleventh centuries that the greater part of the Christians would have thought themselves wanting in the duties of religion if they had not performed a pilgrimage. He who had escaped from a danger, or triumphed over his enemies, assumed the pilgrim's staff, and took the road to the holy places; he who had obtained by his prayers the preservation of a father or of a son, went to return his thanks to heaven far from his domestic hearth, in places rendered holy by religious traditions. A father often devoted his child in the cradle to a pilgrimage, and the first duty of an affectionate and obedient son, when past the age of childhood, was to accomplish the vow of his parents. More than once a dream, a vision in the midst of sleep, imposed upon a Christian the obligation of performing a pilgrimage. Thus, the idea of these pious journeys mixed itself up

¹¹ He destroyed the Holy Sepulchre in 1010.

with all the affections of the heart, and with all the prejudices of the human mind.

Pilgrims were welcomed everywhere, and in return for the hospitality they received, they were only asked for their prayers—often, indeed, the only treasure they carried with them. One of them, desirous to embark at Alexandria for Palestine, presented himself with his script and staff on board a ship, and offered a book of the holy Evangelists in payment for his passage. Pilgrims, on their route, had no other defence against the attacks of the wicked but the cross of Christ. . . .

A pilgrim was a privileged being among the faithful. When he had completed his journey, he acquired the reputation of particular sanctity, and his departure and his return were celebrated by religious ceremonies. When about to set out, a priest presented to him his scrip and staff, together with a gown marked with a cross; he sprinkled holy water over his vestments, and accompanied him, at the head of a procession, as far as the boundaries of the next parish. On his return to his country, the pilgrim gave thanks to God, and presented to the priest a palm-branch, to be deposited on the altar of the church, as an evidence of his undertaking being happily terminated.

[Peter, the Hermit having seen, while on a pilgrimage, the sufferings of the Christians in Palestine, returned to Europe "to be the interpreter of the Christians of the East, and to rouse the West to take arms for their deliverance."]

Peter the Hermit traversed Italy, crossed the Alps, visited all parts of France, and the greatest portion of Europe, inflaming all hearts with the same zeal that consumed his own. He travelled mounted on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his feet bare, his head uncovered, his body girded with a thick cord, covered with a long frock, and a hermit's hood of the coarsest stuff.

The people followed the steps of Peter in crowds. The preacher of the holy war was received everywhere as a messenger from God. They who could touch his vestments esteemed themselves happy, and a portion of hair pulled from the mule he rode was preserved

as a holy relic. At the sound of his voice, differences in families were reconciled, the poor were comforted, the debauched blushed at their errors; nothing was talked of but the virtues of the eloquent cenobite; his austerities and his miracles were described, and his discourses were repeated to those who had not heard him, and been edified by his presence. . . .

The faithful, gathered from all the provinces, had but one single thought; they spoke of nothing but the evils the Christians endured in Palestine, and saw nothing but the war which was about to be declared against the infidels. Enthusiasm and fanaticism, which always increase in large assemblies, were carried to their full height. Pope Urban II at length satisfied the impatience of the faithful, impatience which he, perhaps, had adroitly excited, and which was the surest guarantee of success. . . .

The pontiff sought to awaken in their minds,¹² by turns, ambition, the love of glory, religious enthusiasm, and pity for their Christian brethren. . . . "When Jesus Christ summons you to his defence, let no base affections detain you in your homes; see nothing but the shame and the evils of the Christians; listen to nothing but the groans of Jerusalem, and remember well what the Lord has said to you: *He who loves his father and his mother more than me, is not worthy of me; whoever will abandon his house, or his father, or his mother, or his wife, or his children, or his inheritance, for the sake of my name, shall be recompensed a hundredfold, and possess life eternal.*"

At these words the auditors of Urban displayed an enthusiasm that human eloquence had never before inspired. The assembly arose in one mass as one man, and answered him with a unanimous cry,—"*It is the will of God! It is the will of God!*"

All the faithful promised to respect the decrees of the council, and decorated their garments with a red cross. From that time, all who engaged to combat the infidels were termed "*Bearers of the Cross*,"¹³ and the holy war took the name of *Crusade*.

¹² At the Council of Clermont 1095 A. D.

¹³ Latin *crux*.

The situation in which Europe was then placed, no doubt contributed to increase the number of pilgrims: 'all things were in such disorder,' says William of Tyre, 'that the world appeared to be approaching to its end, and was ready to fall again into the confusion of chaos.' Everywhere the people, as I have already said, groaned under a horrible servitude; a frightful scarcity of provisions, which had, during several years, desolated France and the greater part of the kingdoms of the West, had given birth to all sorts of brigandage and violence; and these proving the destruction of agriculture and commerce, increased still further the horrors of the famine. Villages, towns even, became void of inhabitants, and sank into ruins. The people abandoned a land which no longer nourished them, or could offer them neither repose nor security: the standard of the cross appeared to them a certain asylum against misery and oppression. According to the decrees of the council of Clermont, the Crusaders were freed from all imposts, and could not be pursued for debts during their voyage. At the name of the cross, the very laws suspended their menaces, tyranny could not seek its victims, nor justice even the guilty, amidst those whom the Church adopted for its defenders. The assurance of impunity, the hope of a better fate, the love of license, and a desire to shake off the most sacred ties, actuated a vast proportion of the multitude which flocked to the banners of the crusade.....

Ambition was, perhaps, not foreign to the devotion for the cause of Christ. If religion promised its rewards to those who were going to fight for it, fortune promised them, likewise, riches and the thrones of the earth. All who returned from the East, spoke with enthusiasm of the wonders they had seen, and of the rich provinces they had traversed. It was known that two or three hundred Norman pilgrims had conquered Apulia and Sicily from the Saracens. The lands occupied by the infidels appeared to be heritages promised to knights whose whole wealth consisted in their birth, their valour, and their sword.

We should nevertheless deceive ourselves if we did not be-

lieve that religion was the principle which acted most powerfully upon the greater number of the Crusaders. In ordinary times men follow their natural inclinations, and only obey the voice of their own interest; but in the times of the Crusades, religious fever was a blind passion, which spoke louder than all others. . . .

As soon as the spring appeared, nothing could restrain the impatience of the Crusaders, and they set forward on their march to the places at which they were to assemble. The greater number went on foot; some horsemen appeared amongst the multitude; . . . they were clothed in a variety of manners, and armed in the same way, with lances, swords, javelins, and iron clubs, The crowd of Crusaders presented a whimsical and confused mixture of all ranks and all conditions. . . . From the Tiber to the ocean, and from the Rhine to the other side of the Pyrenees, nothing was to be seen but troops of men marked with the cross, who swore to exterminate the Saracens, and were chanting their songs of conquest beforehand. On all parts resounded the war-cry of the Crusaders—“*It is the will of God! It is the will of God!*”

The number of Christians who had taken the cross in the greater part of the countries of Europe were quite sufficient to form many large armies. As these armies might exhaust the countries through which they had to pass, the princes and captains who were to conduct them agreed among themselves that they should not all set out at one time, but should pursue different routes, and meet again at Constantinople.

Whilst they were engaged in preparations for departure, the multitude who followed Peter the Hermit in his preachings, became impatient to advance before the other Crusaders; and being without a chief, they cast their eyes upon him whom they considered as an envoy from heaven. He yielded to the prayers of the multitude, and, took upon himself the command. His troop, which set out from the banks of the Meuse and Moselle, proceeded towards Germany, and was increased upon the road by a vast number of pilgrims hastening from Champagne, Burgundy, and other parts of France. Peter soon saw from eighty to a hundred

thousand men under his standard. These first Crusaders, dragging in their train women, children, old men, and numerous sick, began their march upon the faith of the miraculous promises made them by their general; in the persuasion they were filled with, that God himself called upon them to defend his cause, they hoped that rivers would open before their battalions, and that manna would fall from heaven to feed them. The army of Peter the Hermit was divided into two bodies; the vanguard marched under the orders of Walter the Penniless. . . .

When the vanguard entered Hungary, they were only disturbed in their march by a few insults, which Walter had the prudence not to avenge; but the resignation of the pilgrims could not hold out long against the misery which every day increased. Want and its attendant evils soon dispersed all the sentiments of moderation to which religion had for a moment given birth in the hearts of its defenders. The governor of Bulgaria not having been able to furnish provisions, they spread themselves about over the country, carried off the flocks, burnt the houses, and massacred several of the inhabitants who opposed their violences. The irritated Bulgarians ran to arms, and fell upon the soldiers of Walter loaded with their booty. A hundred and forty Crusaders perished in the midst of flames, in a church in which they had taken refuge; the rest sought safety in flight. After this defeat, which he did not endeavor to repair, Walter continued his march through the forests of Bulgaria, pursued by famine, and dragging along the wreck of his army. He presented himself as a suppliant before the governor of Nissa, who was touched with the misery of the Crusaders, and gave them provisions, arms, and clothing. . . . After two months of fatigue and misery, they arrived under the walls of Constantinople, where the emperor Alexis permitted them to wait for the army of Peter the Hermit.

The army, which was then passing through Germany, was about to be treated worse than its vanguard had been. The cenobite Peter, more enthusiastic than his soldiers, was more skilful in exciting their zeal than in directing it. He showed neither the

moderation nor the prudence of his lieutenant, and had no idea how to avoid the dangers which awaited him on his route. On arriving on the frontiers of Hungary, he learned the ill-fortune that his companions had met with, and the projects of hostilities formed, as he was told, against the army of the pilgrims. The bodies of several of the Crusaders hung at the gates of Semlin . . . attracted his regard and drew forth his indignation. At this sight, he gave the signal for vengeance and war. The trumpets sounded, the soldiers seized their arms, and hastened to the carnage. Terror preceded them into the city. On their first attack the people took to flight, and sought refuge upon a hill, one side of which was defended by woods and rocks, and the other by the Danube. They were pursued and forced into this last asylum by the furious multitude of the Crusaders. More than four thousand of the inhabitants of Semlin fell under the swords of the conquerors. The bodies carried down by the river bore the tidings of this horrible victory as far as Belgrade.

At this intelligence the Bulgarians and Hungarians were seized with grief and indignation, and in all parts flew to arms. The Crusaders still remained in Semlin, and were glorifying themselves upon their triumph, when all at once an army, assembled in haste by Coloman, king of Hungary, presented itself in their view. Peter had nothing to oppose to his enemies but the soldiers whose blind fury he had himself excited, and with whom it was impossible to make any military disposition. He did not dare to wait for the army of Coloman, and hastened to cross the Morava.

On gaining the territories of the Bulgarians, the Crusaders found the villages and cities abandoned; even Belgrade, the capital, was without inhabitants; they had fled into the forests and mountains. Peter's soldiers, after a painful march, in want of provisions, and with difficulty finding guides to conduct them, arrived at last at the gates of Nissa, a place sufficiently well fortified to be secure from a first attack. . . .

Whilst Peter was conferring with the governor of Nissa, two

thousand soldiers approached the ramparts, and endeavoured to scale them. They were repulsed by the Bulgarians, and supported by a great number of their companions. The fight became general, and the fire of carnage blazed on all parts around the chiefs, who were still speaking of conditions of peace. In vain the hermit had recourse to supplications, to stop the mad progress of his soldiers, in vain he placed himself between the combatants; his voice, so well known to the Crusaders, was lost in the din of arms. They braved his authority; they despised his prayers. His army, which fought without order and without leaders, was routed and cut to pieces. The women, the children, who followed the Crusaders, their horses, their camp equipages, the chest of the army, which contained the numerous offerings of the faithful, all became the prey of an enemy whose fury and vengeance nothing could stop. The hermit Peter, with the wreck of his troop, took refuge on a hill in the neighbourhood of the city.....

A few days after, Peter mustered beneath his command thirty thousand combatants. All the rest had perished in the battle fought under the walls of Nissa. The army of the Crusaders, reduced to a deplorable condition, sought no opportunity of avenging their defeat, but marched with melancholy steps towards the frontiers of Thrace. They were without the means either of subsisting or fighting. They had to fear a fresh defeat if they encountered the Bulgarians, and all the horrors of famine if they came to a desert country. Misfortune rendered them more docile, and inspired them with sentiments of moderation. The pity which their misery excited was more serviceable to them than the terror which they had wished to create. When they ceased to be an object of dread, assistance was afforded them. When they entered the territories of Thrace, the Greek emperor sent deputies to complain of their disorders, but at the same time to announce his clemency. Peter, who dreaded new disasters, wept with joy when he learned that he had found favour with Alexis. Full of confidence and hope, he pursued his march, and the Crusaders,

carrying palms in their hands, arrived without further obstacles under the walls of Constantinople.¹⁴ . . .

The crusades constitute the first great event which opens the epoch of social transformation. They began at the end of the eleventh century, and lasted during the twelfth and thirteenth. Of a surety, a great event; for since it was completed, it has not ceased to occupy philosophic historians; even before reading the account of it, all have foreseen that it was one of those events which change the condition of the people, and which it is absolutely necessary to study in order to comprehend the general course of facts.

The first characteristic of the crusades is their universality; the whole of Europe joined in them—they were the first European event. Previously to the crusades, Europe had never been excited by one sentiment, or acted in one cause; there was no Europe. The crusades revealed Christian Europe. The French formed the vanguard of the first army of crusaders; but there were also Germans, Italians, Spaniards, and English. Observe the second, the third

¹⁴ These few details must suffice. We must omit the account of the errors, sufferings, disasters, defeats, political ambitions, and crimes which fill the chronicles of the crusaders. The murder of the Jews by the Crusaders is a terrible example of the narrow-mindedness of the time.

The first crusade ended with the capture of Jerusalem, 1099 A. D., (See Tasso's great poem *Jerusalem Delivered*). The city however was recaptured by the Mohammedans in 1187. The following different Crusades were undertaken:

The 2d Crusade: preached by Saint Bernard, 1147-1149.

The 3d Crusade: Richard I, Coeur de Lion, of England and Philip Augustus of France, and Frederick Barbarossa of Germany: 1189-1192.

The 4th Crusade: 1202-1204.

The 5th Crusade: 1218-1221.

Children's Crusade: 1212.

The 6th Crusade: etc., 1216-1229.

The 7th Crusade: 1245.

The 8th Crusade: (Louis IX of France, (Saint Louis) 1248-1250. See John Lord de Joinville's *Chronicle of the Crusade of St. Louis* (1309).

The 9th Crusade: (Louis IX again) 1270-1272.

The following paragraphs, on the value of the Crusades, are taken from Guizot's *History of Civilization*.

crusade; all the Christian nations engaged in it. Nothing like it had yet been seen.

This is not all: just as the crusades form a European event, so in each country do they form a national event. All classes of society were animated with the same impression, obeyed the same idea, abandoned themselves to the same impulse. Kings, lords, priests, burghers, countrymen, all took the same part, the same interest in the crusades. The moral unity of nations was shown—a fact as novel as the European unity.... In fact, the crusades constitute the heroic event of modern Europe—a movement at once individual and general, national, and yet unregulated.

I pass at once to the end of the thirteenth century. People still spoke in Europe of the crusades; they even preached them with ardour. The popes excited the sovereigns and the people—they held councils in recommendation of the Holy Land; but no one went there—it was no longer cared for. Something had passed into the European spirit and European society that put an end to the crusades.... A great change had taken place in ideas, sentiments, and social conditions. There were no longer the same wants and desires. They no longer thought or wished the same things...

Two great causes, one moral and the other social, threw Europe into the crusades... The crusades were the continuation, the zenith of the grand struggle which had been going on for four centuries between Christianity and Mahomedanism. The theatre of this struggle had been hitherto in Europe; it was now transported into Asia.... There was another cause, the social state of Europe in the eleventh century, which no less contributed to their outburst... I have attempted to show how everything had become local, how States, existences, minds, were confined within a very limited horizon. It was thus feudalism had prevailed. After some time, a horizon so restricted did not suffice; human thought and activity desired to pass beyond the circle in which they had been confined. The wandering life had ceased, but not the inclination for its excitement and adventures. The people rushed into the crusades as into a new existence, more enlarged

and varied, which at one time recalled the ancient liberty of barbarism, at others opened out the perspective of a vast future.

Such, I believe, were the two determinating causes of the crusades of the twelfth century. At the end of the thirteenth century, neither of these causes existed. Men and society were so much changed, that neither the moral impulsion nor the social need which had precipitated Europe upon Asia, was any longer felt. I do not know if many of you have read the original historians of the crusades, or whether it has ever occurred to you to compare the contemporaneous chroniclers of the first crusades, with those at the end of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; for example, Albert d'Aix, Robert the Monk, and Raymond d'Agiles, who took part in the first crusade, with William of Tyre and James de Vitry. When we compare these two classes of writers, it is impossible not to be struck by the distance which separates them. The first are animated chroniclers, full of vivid imagination, who recount the events of the crusades with passion. But they are, at the same time, men of very narrow minds, without an idea beyond the little sphere in which they have lived; strangers to all science, full of prejudices, and incapable of forming any judgment whatever upon what passes around them, or upon the events which they relate. Open, on the contrary, the history of the crusades by William of Tyre: you will be surprised to find almost a historian of modern times, a mind developed, extensive and free, a rare political understanding of events, completeness of views, a judgment bearing upon causes and effects. James de Vitry affords an example of a different kind of development; he is a scholar, who not only concerns himself with what has reference to the crusades, but also occupies himself with manners, geography, ethnography, natural history; who observes and describes the country. . . . Between the chroniclers of the first crusades and the historians of the last, there is an immense interval, which indicates a veritable revolution in mind.

This revolution is above all seen in the manner in which each speaks of the Mahommedans. To the first chroniclers, and conse-

quently to the first crusaders, of whom the first chroniclers are but the expression, the Mahommedans are only an object of hatred. It is evident that they knew nothing of them; . . . we discover no trace of any social relation; they detested and fought them, and that was all. William of Tyre, James de Vitry, and Bernard the Treasurer, speak quite differently of the Mussulmans: one feels that, although fighting them, they do not look upon them as mere monsters; that to a certain point they have entered into their ideas; that they have lived with them, that there is a sort of relation, and even a kind of sympathy established between them. . . .

This, then, was the first and principal effect of the crusades, a great step towards the enfranchisement of mind, a great progress towards more extensive and liberal ideas. . . . It is a common saying that the mind of travellers becomes enlarged; that the habit of observing various nations and manners, and different opinions, extends the ideas, and frees the judgment from old prejudices. The same fact was accomplished among these travelling nations who were called crusaders: their minds were opened and elevated, by seeing a multitude of different things, and by observing other manners than their own. They also found themselves in juxtaposition with two civilizations, not only different from their own, but more advanced; the Greek on the one hand, and the Mahomedan on the other. There can be no doubt that the Greek society, although enervated, perverted, and falling into decay, had upon the crusaders the effect of a more advanced, polished, and enlightened society than their own. The Mahomedan society afforded them a spectacle of the same nature. It is curious to observe in the old chronicles the impression which the crusaders made upon the Mussulmans; these latter regarded them at first as barbarians, as the rudest, most ferocious, and most stupid class of men they had ever seen. The crusaders, on their part, were struck with the riches and elegance of manners of the Mussulmans. To this first impression succeeded frequent relations between the two people. These extended and became much more important than is generally supposed. Not only had the Christians of the east

habitual relations with the Mussulmans, but the west and the east became acquainted, visited and mixed with each other. It is not long since that one of those scholars who honour France in the eyes of Europe, M. Abel Remusat, discovered the existence of relations between the Mongol emperors and the Christian kings. Mongol ambassadors were sent to the Frank kings, to Saint Louis among others, to treat for an alliance with them, and to recommence the crusades in the common interest of the Mongols and the Christians against the Turks. And not only were diplomatic and official relations thus established between the sovereigns; frequent and various national relations were formed. I quote the words of M. Abel Remusat.

"Many Italian, French, and Flemish monks, were charged with diplomatic missions to the Great Khan. Mongols of distinction came to Rome, Barcelona, Valentia, Lyons, Paris, London, Northampton; and a Franciscan of the kingdom of Naples was archbishop of Pekin. His successor was a professor of theology of the faculty of Paris. But how many others, less known, were drawn after these, either as slaves, or attracted by the desire for gain, or guided by curiosity into countries till then unknown! Chance has preserved the names of some: the first who came to visit the king of Hungary, on the part of the Tartars, was an Englishman, banished from his country for certain crimes, and who, after wandering all over Asia, ended by taking service among the Mongols. A Flemish shoemaker met in the depths of Tartary a woman from Metz, named Paquette, who had been carried off from Hungary; a Parisian goldsmith, whose brother was established at Paris, upon the great bridge; and a young man from the environs of Rouen, who had been at the taking of Belgrade. He saw, also, Russians, Hungarians, and Flemings. A chorister, named Robert, after having travelled over Eastern Asia, returned to finish his days in the cathedral of Chartres. A Tartar was purveyor of helmets in the army of Philip the Handsome; John de Plancarpin found near Gayouk a Russian gentleman, whom he calls Temer, who was serving as an interpreter; many merchants of Breslaw, Poland, and Austria, accompanied him in his journey to Tartary. Others returned with him by way of Russia; these were Genoese, Pisans, and Venetians. Two merchants, whom chance had led to Bokhara, consented to follow a Mongol am-

bassador sent by Koulagou to Khoubilai. They sojourned several years both in China and Tartary, returned with letters from the Great Khan to the pope; again returned to the Great Khan, taking with them the son of one of them, the celebrated Marco Polo, and again quitted the court of Khoubilai to return to Venice. Travels of this kind were not less frequent in the following century. Among the number are those of Sir John Mandeville, an English physician, of Oderic of Friuli, of Pegoletti, of William de Bouldeselle, and several others; and we may suppose, that those whose memorials are preserved, form but the least part of what were undertaken, and that there were at this period more persons capable of executing long journeys than of writing an account of them. Many of these adventurers remained and died in the countries which they visited. Others returned to their country as obscure as when they left it; but with an imagination filled with what they had seen, relating it to their family, exaggerating, no doubt, but leaving around them, amidst absurd fables, useful remembrances and traditions capable of bearing fruit. Thus in Germany, Italy, and France, in the monasteries, in the castles of the lords, and even down to the lowest ranks of society, were deposited precious seeds destined before long to germinate. All these unknown travellers carried the arts of their native land into the most distant countries, brought back other knowledge no less precious, and thus made, without being aware of it, more advantageous exchanges than all those of commerce. By these means, not only the trade in silk, porcelain, and Indian commodities was extended and facilitated—new routes opened to commercial industry and activity—but, what was of much more importance, foreign manners, unknown nations, extraordinary productions, offered themselves in crowds to the minds of the Europeans, confined, since the fall of the Roman empire, within too narrow a circle. They began to know the value of the most beautiful, the most populous, and the most anciently civilized of the four quarters of the globe. They began to study the arts, creeds, and idioms of its inhabitants, and there was even talk of establishing a professorship of the Tartar language in the university of Paris. Romantic narrative, when duly discussed and investigated, spread on all sides more just and varied notions. The world seemed to open on the side of the east; geography took a great stride, and the desire for discovery became the new form which clothed the adventurous spirit of the Europeans. The idea of another hemisphere ceased to present itself as a paradox void of all probability, when our own became better known; and it was in

searching for the Zipangri of Marco Polo that Christopher Columbus discovered the New World...."

You see what, at the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, was the new and vast world which was thrown open to the European mind. There can be no doubt that this was one of the most powerful causes of development, and of the freedom of mind which shone forth at the end of this great event....

[Special topics should be given if time allows on: each crusade; St. Bernard; the Templars; the Hospitalers; the crusades in literature; with a review of the topics on the Franciscans, Dominicans, Marco Polo, Mandeville, etc. Of course the preceding pages on the crusades, as well as the following ones on the discoveries, should be read for the impression chiefly; almost no facts need be memorized.]

THE RISE OF FREE CITIES

The medieval knight¹⁵ was a country squire and was rarely forced to pay for materials in money. His estates produced everything that he and his family ate and drank and wore on their backs. The bricks for his house were made along the banks of the nearest river. Wood for the rafters of the hall was cut from the baronial forest. The few articles that had to come from abroad were paid for in goods—in honey, in eggs, in fagots.

But the Crusades upset the routine of that old agricultural life in a very drastic fashion. Suppose that the Duke of Hildesheim was going to the Holy Land. He must travel thousands of miles, and he must pay his passage and his hotel bills. At home he could pay with products of his farm. But he could not well take a hundred dozen eggs and a cartload of hams with him to satisfy the greed of the shipping agent of Venice or the innkeeper of the Brenner Pass. These gentlemen insisted upon cash. His lordship therefore was obliged to take a small quantity of gold with him upon his voyage. Where could he find this gold? He could borrow it from the Lombards, the descendants of the old Longobards, who had turned professional money-lenders and, seated behind their

¹⁵ The following paragraphs, taken from *The Story of Mankind* by Hendrik Van Loon, and quoted by the kind permission of the Liveright Publishing Corporation, show in an amusing way the influence the Crusades had on the rise of free cities.

exchange-table (commonly known as "banco" or bank), were glad to let his Grace have a few hundred gold pieces in exchange for a mortgage upon his estates, that they might be repaid in case his Lordship should die at the hands of the Turks.

That was dangerous business for the borrower. In the end, the Lombards often owned the estates and the knight became a bankrupt, who hired himself out as a fighting man to a more powerful and more careful neighbor.

His Grace could also go to that part of the town where the Jews were forced to live. There he could borrow money at a rate of fifty or sixty per cent interest. That, too, was bad business. But was there a way out? Some of the people of the little city which surrounded the castle were said to have money. They had known the young lord all his life. His father and their fathers had been good friends. They would not be unreasonable in their demands. Very well. His Lordship's clerk, a monk who could write and keep accounts, sent a note to the best known merchants and asked for a small loan. The townspeople met in the work-room of the jeweller who made chalices for the near-by churches and discussed this demand. They could not well refuse. It would serve no purpose to ask for "interest." In the first place, it was against the religious principles of most people to take interest and in the second place, it would never be paid except in agricultural products and of these the people had enough and to spare.

"But," suggested the tailor who spent his days quietly sitting upon his table and who was somewhat of a philosopher, "suppose that we ask some favor in return for our money. We are all fond of fishing. But his Lordship won't let us fish in his brook. Suppose that we let him have a hundred ducats and that he give us in return a written guarantee allowing us to fish all we want in all of his rivers. Then he gets the hundred which he needs, but we get the fish and it will be good business all around."

The day his Lordship accepted this proposition (it seemed such an easy way of getting a hundred gold pieces) he signed the death-warrant of his own power. His clerk drew up the agreement.

His Lordship made his mark (for he could not sign his name) and departed for the East. Two years later he came back, dead broke. The townspeople were fishing in the castle pond. The sight of the silent row of anglers annoyed his Lordship. He told his equerry to go and chase the crowd away. They went, but that night a delegation of merchants visited the castle. They were very polite. They congratulated his Lordship upon his safe return. They were sorry his Lordship had been annoyed by the fishermen, but as his Lordship might perhaps remember he had himself given them permission to fish, and the tailor produced the Charter which had been kept in the safe of the jeweller ever since the master had gone to the Holy Land.

His Lordship was much annoyed. But once more he was in dire need of some money. In Italy he had signed his name to certain documents which were now in the possession of Silvestro dei Medici, the well-known banker. These documents were "promissory notes," and they were due two months from date. Their total amount came to three hundred and forty pounds, Flemish gold. Under these circumstances, the noble knight could not well show the rage which filled his heart and his proud soul. Instead, he suggested another little loan. The merchants retired to discuss the matter.

After three days they came back and said "yes." They were only too happy to be able to help their master in his difficulties, but in return for the 345 golden pounds would he give them another written promise (another charter) that they, the townspeople, might establish a council of their own to be elected by all the merchants and free citizens of the city, said council to manage civic affairs without interference from the castle?

His Lordship was confoundedly angry. But again, he needed the money. He said yes, and signed the charter. Next week, he repented. He called his soldiers and went to the house of the jeweller and asked for the documents which his crafty subjects had cajoled out of him under the pressure of circumstances. He took them away and burned them. The townspeople stood by and said

nothing. But when next his Lordship needed money to pay for the dowry of his daughter, he was unable to get a single penny. After that little affair at the jeweller's his credit was not considered good. He was forced to eat humble pie and offer to make certain reparations. Before his Lordship got the first installment of the stipulated sum, the townspeople were once more in possession of all their old charters and a brand new one which permitted them to build a "city hall" and a strong tower where all the charters might be kept protected against fire and theft, which really meant protected against future violence on the part of the lord and his armed followers.

[Special topics should be given briefly on: Venice; Milan; Genoa; the Hanseatic League; Hamburg; Lubeck; Bremen; Cologne; Augsburg; Nuremberg; Antwerp; Bruges; Ghent; and possibly others.]

DISCOVERIES

The end of the Middle Ages¹⁶ is marked, not only by the destruction of hitherto prevalent political forms, but also by the simultaneous revolution in commercial affairs, consequent upon the discovery of America and of the passage to the Indies around the Cape of Good Hope.

Up to that time, commerce had followed the routes marked out by the Greeks and the Romans. The products of the East reached Europe by the Red Sea and Egypt, or through Persia and the Black Sea. But the peoples who bordered on the Atlantic had long been turning their gaze toward the mysterious expanse of its unknown waters. They had become familiar with its tempests and had gained confidence in the compass. The Normans had been the first to enter upon the path of maritime discoveries along the western coast of Africa. There the Portuguese, more advantage-

¹⁶ We take the following excerpts on the discoveries, from the *General History of the World*, by Victor Duruy, by kind permission of the Thomas Y. Crowell Company. The quotations from Richard Hakluyt's *Voyages* are taken from the edition of 1850 by John Winter Jones, of the British Museum, who gives us the facsimile of the title page.

ously situated, followed and outstripped them. In 1472 they crossed the equator. In 1486 Bartolomeo Diaz discovered the Cape of Storms, which King John II, [King of Portugal], more wisely named the Cape of Good Hope. In fact, Vasco da Gama soon sailed round the African continent and reached Calicut on the Malabar coast (1498). Later on Camoens in his *Lusiad* painted this heroic expedition. At Calicut Alvarez Cabral founded the first European establishment in the Indies. On the way thither he had been cast upon the coast of Brazil.

The true creator of the Portuguese colonies was Albuquerque. By the Capture of Socotora and Ormuz, he closed the ancient routes of Indian commerce to the Mussulmans and to Venice. He gave to Portuguese India its capital by taking possession of Goa (1510). He conquered Malacca and secured the alliance of the kings of Siam and Pegu and the possession of the Molucca Islands. While preparing one expedition against Egypt and another against Arabia, where he wished to destroy Mecca and Medina, he was arrested by an unmerited disgrace (1515). The conquest continued under John de Castro, who seized Cambaye. Japan was discovered in 1542, and a trading station set up opposite Canton in the island of Sanciam. Goa was the centre of Portuguese domination. The other principal points in their empire were Mozambique, Sofala and Melinda on the African coast, whence they obtained gold-dust and ivory; Muscat and Ormuz, on the Persian Gulf, whither came the products of Central Asia; Diu, on the coast of Malabar; Negapatam, on that of Coromandel; Malacca, in the peninsula of the same name, which threw into their hands the commerce of the countries of Indo-China; and the Moluccas, where they occupied Ternate and Timor, and whence they exported spices. Their trading stations on the western coast of Africa and on the Congo were of no importance until after the establishment of the slave trade. For a long time, the only colonists whom Brazil received were criminals and deported Jews.

The discovery of America had taken place earlier, in 1492. The Genoese navigator, Christopher Columbus, engrossed with

the idea that India must extend far toward the west as a counter-balance to the European continent, hoped to reach its furthest shore by directing his course westward across the Atlantic. Rebuffed as a visionary by the Senate of Genoa and by the king of Portugal, as well as for a time by the court of Spain, he succeeded in obtaining from Isabella three small vessels. After sailing for two months he landed on October 11, 1492, in Guanahani, one of the Lucaya Islands, which he named San Salvador. Only during his third voyage in 1498 did he touch the continent, without knowing it, and on the fourth in 1502 discovered the coast of Columbia. He still believed that he had reached the shores of India. Hence was derived the name, West Indies, which long prevailed. The name America refers to Amerigo Vespucci, who merely enjoyed the inferior distinction of landing on the mainland before Columbus.

The route once found, discoveries followed each other in rapid succession. In 1513 Balboa traversed the Isthmus of Panama and caught sight of the Great Ocean. In 1518 Grijalva discovered Mexico, of which Fernando Cortés effected the conquest (1519-1521). In 1520 Magellan reached the strait to which his name has been given between South America and Tierra del Fuego. He traversed the Pacific Ocean, where he died, and his comrades returned to Spain by way of the Moluccas and the Cape of Good Hope. They were the first to make the circuit of the globe. The adventurers, Almagro and Pizarro, gave to the crown of Spain, Peru and Chili. Others founded on the opposite coast Buenos Ayres, at the mouth of the Plata. In 1534 Cartier discovered Canada for France.

The Portuguese colonies rapidly declined. They were only a line of trading posts along the coasts of Africa and Hindustan, without power of resistance, because few Portuguese settled there. The Spanish colonies, which in the beginning aimed not so much at commerce as at the development of the mines, attracted on the contrary many Spaniards to the New World, and formed in America a compact domination, divided into the two governments

of Mexico and Lima. At the present day Mexico and South America are dominated by Spanish blood, while Brazil is Portuguese.

These discoveries threw open to the industrious activity of the men of the West both a New World and also that East where so much idle wealth was locked up. They changed the course and form of trade. For land commerce, which hitherto had held first rank, maritime commerce was about to be substituted. As a result the cities of the interior were to decline and those on the coast to expand. Moreover commercial importance passed from the countries bathed by the Mediterranean to the countries situated on the Atlantic, from the Italians to the Spaniards and the Portuguese, and later on from these latter to the Dutch and the English. Not only did these peoples grow rich, but they were enriched in a peculiar manner. The mines of Mexico and Peru threw into European circulation an enormous mass of specie. Industry, commerce and agriculture developed on receiving the capital which they required in order to thrive. "The third part of the kingdom of France," says a writer of the sixteenth century, "was put under cultivation in the course of a few years." All this created a new power in personal wealth which fell into the hands of the burgher class, and which in after centuries was to battle with the landed wealth still remaining in the hands of the lords. . . .

From Richard Hakluyt's Voyages

[Richard Hakluyt (1553-1616), one of the earliest English writers on travel, tells us how he became interested in the subject: "I do remember that being a youth, and one of her Majestie's scholars at Westminster, that fruitful nurserie, it was my happe to visit the chamber of M. Richard Hakluyt, my cosin, a gentleman of the Middle Temple, well known unto you, at a time when I found lying open upon his boord certeine bookes of cosmographie with an universall mappe: he seeing me somewhat curious in the view thereof, began to instruct my ignorance by shewing me the division of the earth into three parts after the olde account, and then according to the latter and better distribution into more. He pointed with his wand to all the known seas, gulfs, bayes, straights, capes, rivers, empires, kingdoms, dukedoms, and territories of ech part; with declaration also of their special commodities and particular wants which by the benefit of traffike and intercourse of merchants are plentifully supplied. From the mappe he brought me to the Bible, and turning to the 107th Psalm, directed mee to the 23rd and 24th verses, where I

read that they which go downe to the sea in ships and occupy by the great waters, they see the works of the Lord and his woonders in the deepe, etc., which words of the Prophet, together with my cousins discourse (things of high and rare delight to my yong nature) tooke in me so deepe an impression, that I constantly resolved if ever I were preferred to the university, where better time and more convenient place might be ministreed for these studies, would, by God's assistance, prosecute that knowledge and kinde of literature, the doores whereof (after a sort) were so happily opened before me." His interest led him to publish the accounts by various explorers of their voyages, evidently with the idea of encouraging English settlements in the new world.]

DIVERS

voyages touching the discoverie of
America and the Ilands adjacent

vnto the same, made first of all by our
*Englishmen and afterwards by the Frenchmen and Britons*¹⁷

And certain notes of aduertisements and obserua-
tion, necessarie for such as shall heereafter
make the like attempt.

With two Mappes annexed heereunto for the
plainer understanding of the whole
matter.

Imprinted at Lon-
don for Thomas Woodcocke,
dwelling in paules Church-Yard
at the signe of the blacke beare.

1582

From his *Epistle Dedicatorie* [to Sir Philip Sidney] in *Divers Voyages*.

I maruaile not a little (right worshipfull) that since the first discoverie of America (which is nowe full fourescore and tenne yeeres), after so great conquests and plantings of the Spaniardes and Portingales there, that wee of Englande could neuer haue the grace to set fast footing in such fertill and temperate places as are left as yet vnpossessed of them. But againe, when I consider that there is a time for all men. . . . I conceiue great hope that the time

¹⁷ Bretons, from Brittany.

approcheth and nowe is, that we of England may share and part stakes (if wee will our selues), both with the spaniarde and the Portingale, in part of America and other regions, as yet vndiscovered. And surely if there were in vs that desire to aduance the honour of our countrie which ought to bee in euery good man, wee woulde not all this while haue foreslowne¹⁸ the possessing of those landes, whiche of equitie and right appertaine vnto vs, as by the discourses that followe shall appeare most plainly. Yea, if wee woulde beholde with the eye of pitie how al our Prisons are pestered and filled with able men to serue their Countrie, which for small roberies are dayly hanged vp in great numbers, euen twentie at a clappe, out of one iayle (as was seene at the last assizes at Rochester), wee woulde hasten and further euery man to his power the deducting of some Colonies of our superfluous people into those temperate and fertile partes of America, which, being within sixe weekes sayling of England, are yet vnpossessed by any Christians: and seeme to offer themselves vnto vs, stretching neerer vnto her Maiesties Dominions then to any other part of Europe. Wee reade that the Bees whe' they grow to be too many in their own hiues at home, are wont to bee led out by their Captaines to swarme abroad and seeke themselues a new dwelling place. If the examples of the Grecians and Carthaginians of olde time and the practise of our age may not mooue vs, yet let vs learne wisdom of these smal weake and vnreasonable creatures. It chaunced very lately that vpon occasion I had great conference in matters of Cosmographie with an excellent learned man of Portingale, most priuie to all the discoueries of his nation, who wondered that those blessed countries from the point of Florida Northward were all this while vnplanted by Christians, protesting with great affection and zeale, that if hee were nowe as young as I (for at this present hee is threescore yeeres of age) hee woulde sel all hee had, being a man of no small wealth and honour, to furnish conuenient number of ships to sea for the inhabiting of those countries, and reducing those gentile people to christianitie. Moreouer, hee added, that John Barros, their chiefe Cosmographer, being moued with the like desire, was the cause¹⁹ that Bresilia was first inhabited by the Portingales: where they haue nine baronies or lordships, and thirtie engennies or sugar milles, two or three hundred slaues belonging to eche myll, with a Iudge and other officers and a Church: so that euery mill is as it were a little

¹⁸ Neglected.

¹⁹ Probably an error.

common wealth: and that the countrie was first planted by such men as for small offences were saued from the rope. This hee spake not onely vnto mee and in my hearing, but also in the presence of a friend of mine, a man of great skill in the Mathe-matikes. If this mans desire might bee executed, wee might not only for the present time take possession of that good land, but also, in short space, by God's grace, finde out that shorte and easie passage by the Northwest, which we haue hetherto so long desired, and whereof wee haue many good and more then probable coniectures. . . . To drawe to an ende I haue heare, right worship-full, in this hastie worke first put downe the title which we haue to that part of America which is from Florida to 67 degrees north-ward by the letters patentes graunted to John Gabote and his three sonnes, Lewes, Sebastian, and Santius, with Sebastians owne Certificate to Baptista Ramusius of his discoverie of America, and the testimonie of Fabien, our own Chronicler. Next, I have caused to bee added the letters of Mr. Robert Thorne to King Henrie the eight, and his discourse to his Ambassadour, doctor Ley, in Spaine, of the like argument, with the Kings setting out of two ships for discoveries in the 19 yere of his raigne. Ther I have translated the voyage of Iohn Verarzanus from thirtie degrees to Cape Briton (and the last yeere, at my charges and other of my friendes, by my exhortation, I caused Iaques Cartiers two voyages of discovering the grand Bay, and Canada, Saguinay, and Hochelaga, to bee translated out of my Volumes, which are to be annexed to this present translation).

A Note of Sebastian Gabotes Voyage of
Discoverie, taken out of an old Chronicle, written by
Robert Fabian, sometime Alderman of London,
which is in the custodie of John Stowe, Citizen,
a diligent searcher and preseruer of Antiquities.

This yeere the King (by meanes of a Venetian, whiche made himselfe very expert and cunning in knoweledge of the circuite of the worlde and Ilandes of the same as by a Carde and other demonstrations reasonable hee shewed), caused to man and victuall a shippe at Bristowe, to search for an Ilande, whiche hee saide hee knewe well was riche and replenished with riche commodities. Which Ship, thus manned and victualed at the kings cost, diuers merchants of London ventured in her small stockes, being in her as chiefe Patrone the saide Venetian. And in the companie of the saide shippe sayled also out of Bristowe three or

four small ships fraught with sleight and grosse merchandizes, as course cloth, Caps, Laces, points, and other trifles, and so departed from Bristowe in the beginning of May: of whom in this Maiors time returned no tidings.

Of three sauage men which hee brought home and presented vnto the king in the xvii yeere of his raigne.

This yeere also were brought vnto the king three men, taken in the new founde Iland, that before I spake of in William Purchas time, being Maior. These were clothed in beastes skinnnes, and ate rawe fleshe, and spake such speech that no man coulde understand them, and in their demeanour like to bruite beastes, whom the king kept a time after.

Of the which vpon two yeares past after I saw two apparelled after the maner of Englishmen, in Westminster pallace, which at that time I coulde not discerne from Englishmen, till I was learned what they were. But as for speech, I heard none of them vtter one worde.

John Baptista Ramusius, in his preface to the thirde volume of the nauigations, writeth thus of Sebastian Gabot:—

In the latter part of this volume are put certaine relations of John de Verarzana, a Florentine, and of a great Captaine a Frenchman, and the two voyages of Jaques Cartier, a Briton,²⁰ who sailed vnto the lande set in fiftie degrees of latitude to the north, which is called New France: and the which landes hitherto it is not thoroughly knowne whether they doe ioyne with the firme lande of Florida and *Noua Hispania*, or whether they be separated and diuided all by the Sea as Ilands: and whether that by that way one may goe by Sea vnto the countrie of Cathaio: as many yeeres past it was written vnto me by Sebastian Gaboto, our countrie man Venetian, a man of great experience, and very rare in the art of Nauigation and the knowledge of Cosmographie: who sayled along and beyonde this lande of Newe Fraunce, at the charges of King Henrie the seuenth, king of Englande. And hee tolde mee, that hauing sayled a long time West and by North beyonde these Ilandes vnto the latitude of 67 degrees and an halfe under the North Pole, and at the 11 day of June, finding still the open Sea without any manner of impediment, hee thought verily by that

²⁰ Breton, from Brittany.

way to haue passed on still the way to Cathaio, which is in the East, and woulde haue done it, if the mutinie of the shipmaster and marriners had not rebelled, and made him to returne homewards from that place. But it seemeth that God doth yet still reserue this great enterprise for some great Prince to dicouer this voyage of Cathaio by this way; which for the bringing of the spiceries from India into Europe were the most easie and shortest of all other wayes hetherto founde out. And, surely, this enterprise woulde bee the most glorious, and of most importance of all other, that can be imagined, to make his name great, and fame immortall, to all ages to come, farre more then can be done by any of all these great troubles and warres, which dayly are vsed in Europe among the miserable Christian people.

This much concerning Sebastian Gabotes discouerie may suffice for a present cast: but shortly, God willing, shall come out in print, all his owne mappes and discourses, drawne and written by himself, which are in the custodie of the worshipfull master Williã Worthington, one of her Maiesties Pensioners, who (because so worthie monuments shoulde not be buried in perpetual obliuion) is very willing to suffer them to be ouerseene and published in as good order as may bee, to the encouragement and benefite of our Countriemen.

THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING

New Interest in Ancient Greek Manuscripts

The true epoch of the revival of Greek literature in Italy, cannot be placed before the year 1395, when Emanuel Chrysoloras, previously known as an ambassador from Constantinople to the western powers, in order to solicit assistance against the Turks, was induced to return to Florence as public teacher of Greek. He passed from thence to various Italian universities, [Rome, Padua, Milan, and Venice].²¹

The scholars who assembled in the lecture-rooms of Chrysoloras, felt that the Greek texts, whereof he alone supplied the key, contained those elements of spiritual freedom and intellectual culture without which the civilization of the modern world would

²¹ Taken from Hallam's *Literature of Europe*.

be impossible. Nor were they mistaken in what was then a guess rather than a certainty. The study of Greek implied the birth of criticism, comparison, research. Systems based on ignorance and superstition were destined to give way before it. The study of Greek opened philosophical horizons far beyond the dream-world of the churchmen and the monks: it stimulated the germs of science, suggested new astronomical hypotheses, and indirectly led to the discovery of America. The study of Greek resuscitated a sense of the beautiful in art and literature. It subjected the creeds of Christianity, the language of the Gospels, the doctrine of St. Paul, to analysis, and commenced a new era for Biblical inquiry.²²

John Aurispa of Sicily, brought back to Italy 238 manuscripts from Greece about 1423, and thus put his country in possession of authors hardly known to her by name. Among these were Plato, Plotinus, Diodorus, Strabo, Pindar, [etc. etc.]. After teaching Greek at Bologna and Florence, Aurispa also ended a length of days under the patronage of the house of Este, at Ferrara. To these may be added in the list of public instructors in Greek before 1440, Filelfo, who returned from Greece in 1427 laden with manuscripts.²¹

Many of these cultivators of the Greek language devoted their leisure to translating the manuscripts brought into Italy. They did not find any great public encouragement in the early stages of their teaching. That encouragement, however, had been accorded before the year 1440. Nicolas of Este, Marquis of Ferrara, received men in his hospitable court. But none was so celebrated or useful in this patronage of letters as Cosmo de' Medici, the Pericles of Florence. Niccoli, a wealthy citizen of Florence, deserves to be remembered on account of his care for the good instruction of youth (which caused him to be called the Florentine Socrates) and for his liberality as well as diligence in collecting books and monuments of antiquity. The public library

²² Taken from John Addington Symonds' *The Revival of Learning*.

of St. Mark was founded on a bequest by Niccoli, in 1437, of his own collection of eight hundred manuscripts.²¹

With²² regard to the actual knowledge of Latin literature possessed in the Middle Ages, it may be said in brief that Virgil was continually studied, and that a certain familiarity with Ovid, Lucan, Horace, Juvenal, and Statius was never lost. Of Greek there was absolutely no tradition left. When the names of Greek poets or philosophers are cited by mediaeval authors, it is at second hand from Latin sources; and the Aristotelian logic of the schoolmen came through Latin translations made by Jews from Arabian manuscripts. Occasionally it might happen that a Western scholar acquired Greek at Constantinople or in the south of Italy, where it was spoken. Greek was hardly less lost to Europe, then however, than Sanskrit in the first half of the eighteenth century.

The meagerness of mediaeval learning was a less serious obstacle to culture than the habit of mind which prevented students from appreciating the true spirit of the classics. It was not enough to multiply books; they had to teach men how to read them, to explain their inspiration, to defend them against prejudice, to protect them from false methods of interpretation. To purge the mind of fancy and fable, to prove that poetry apart from its supposed prophetic meaning was delightful for its own sake, and that the history of the ancient nations, in spite of paganism, could be used for profit and instruction, was the first step to be taken by these pioneers of modern culture. The achievement of this revolution in thought was the great performance of the Italians in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Dante and Petrarch

Dante does not belong in any strict sense to the history of the Revival of Learning. The *Divine Comedy* closes the Middle Ages and preserves their spirit. It stands before the vestibule of modern literature like a solitary mountain at the entrance of a country rich in all varieties of landscape.

²² We quote now from John Addington Symonds' *Revival of Learning*.

There are spots upon the central watershed of Europe where, in the stillness of a summer afternoon, the traveller may listen to the murmurs of two streams—the one hurrying down to form the Rhine, the other to contribute to the Danube or the Po. While the one sweeps onward to the Northern seas, the other will reach the shores of Italy or Greece and mingle with the Mediterranean. To these two streamlets we might compare Dante and Petrarch, both of whom sprang from Florence, both of whom were nurtured in the learning of the schools and in the lore of chivalrous love. Yet how different was their mission! Petrarch marks the rising of that great river of intellectual energy which flowed southward to recover the culture of the ancient world. The current of Dante's genius took the contrary direction. Borne upon its mighty flood, we visit the lands and cities of the Middle Ages.

In speaking of Petrarch here, it is necessary to concentrate attention upon his claims to be considered as the apostle of scholarship, the inaugurator of the humanistic impulse of the fifteenth century. We have nothing to do with his Italian poetry. To have foreseen a whole new phase of European culture, is in truth a higher title to fame than the composition of even the most perfect sonnets.

The essence of humanism consisted in a new and vital perception of the dignity of man, and in the further perception that classic literature alone displayed nature in the plenitude of intellectual and moral freedom. It was partly a reaction against ecclesiastical despotism, partly an attempt to find the point of unity for all that had been thought and done by man. Humanism in this, the widest sense of the word, was possessed by Petrarch intuitively. Though he could not read Greek, he welcomed with profoundest reverence the copies of Homer and Plato sent to him from Constantinople, and exhorted Boccaccio to dedicate his genius to the translation of the sovran poet into Latin.

In his passion for collecting manuscripts, and in the intuition that the future of scholarship depended upon the resuscitation of Greek studies, Petrarch initiated the most important impetus of

the classical Renaissance. He again was the first to understand the value of public libraries; the first to accumulate coins and inscriptions, as the source of accurate historical information; the first to preach the duty of preserving ancient monuments. It would seem as though by the instinct of genius he foresaw the future for at least three centuries, and comprehended the highest uses whereof scholarship is capable.

How fully he possessed the large and liberal spirit of humanism is shown by the untiring war he carried on against formalism, tradition, pedantry, and superstition. Whatever might impede the free play of the intellect aroused his bitterest hatred. Against the narrow views of scholastic theologians, against the lawyers and physicians and astrologers in vogue, he declared inexorable hostility. Italian humanism never lost the powerful impress of his genius.

We are therefore justified in hailing Petrarch as the Columbus of a new spiritual hemisphere, the discoverer of modern culture. But for his intervention in the fourteenth century, it is possible that the Revival of Learning, and all that it implies, might have been delayed until too late. Petrarch died in 1374. The Greek Empire was destroyed in 1453.²⁴ Between those dates Italy recovered the Greek classics; but whether the Italians would have undertaken this labor if no Petrarch had preached the attractiveness of liberal studies, or if no school of disciples had been formed by him in Florence, remains more than doubtful. The reawakening faith in human reason, the reawakening belief in the dignity of man, the desire for beauty, the liberty, audacity, and passion of the Renaissance, received from Greek studies their strongest and most vital impulse.

Universities

The oldest and most frequented university in Italy, that of Bologna, is represented as having flourished in the twelfth century.

²⁴ The Turks, (or Mohammedans or Saracens), had been for centuries pushing their conquests westward, towards Constantinople. In 1453 Constantinople fell into their hands, and it remained theirs until, after the World-War, it was made a neutral zone.

Its prosperity in early times depended greatly on the principal professors, who, when they were not satisfied with their entertainment were in the habit of seceding with their pupils to other cities. Thus schools were opened from time to time in Modena, Reggio, and elsewhere by teachers who broke oaths that bound them to reside in Bologna, and fixed their center of education in a rival town. To make such temporary changes was not difficult in an age when a university consisted of masters and scholars, without college buildings, without libraries, without endowments, and without scientific apparatus. The lists of illustrious students at Bologna between 1265 and 1294 show men of all the European nationalities, proving that the foreigners attracted by the university must have formed no inconsiderable element in the whole population.

The great University of Padua²⁵ first saw light in consequence of political discords forcing the professors to quit Bologna for a season. That of Florence was first founded in 1321. The subjects taught in the schools were Canon and Civil Law, Medicine, and Theology.

The fact, however, remains, that the real home of the humanists was in the courts of princes and in the palaces of the cultivated burghers; the private academies formed by the literati and their patrons, the schools of princes, and the residences of great nobles play a more important part in the history of humanism than do the universities.

Books

Scarcity of books was at first a chief impediment to the study of antiquity. Popes and princes and even great religious institutions possessed far fewer books than many farmers of the present age. The library belonging to the Cathedral Church of San Martino at Lucca in the ninth century contained only nineteen volumes of abridgements from ecclesiastical commentaries. The Cathedral

²⁵ One of the oldest and most famous of the universities of Europe; it was founded in the thirteenth century.

of Novara in 1212 could boast copies of Boethius, Priscian, the *Code of Justinian*, the *Decretals*, and the *Etymology* of Isidorus, besides a Bible and some devotional treatises. This slender stock passed for great riches. Each of the precious volumes in such a collection was an epitome of mediaeval art. Its pages were composed of fine vellum adorned with pictures. The initial letters displayed elaborate flourishes and exquisitely illuminated groups of figures. The scribe took pains to render his calligraphy perfect, and to ornament the margins with crimson, gold, and blue. Then he handed the parchment sheets to the binder, who encased them in rich settings of velvet or carved ivory and wood, embossed with gold and precious stones. The edges were gilt and stamped with patterns. The clasps were wrought silver chased with niello.²⁶

The price of such masterpieces was enormous. Borso d'Este, in 1464, gave eight gold ducats²⁷ to Gherardo Ghislieri of Bologna for an illuminated Lancelotto, and in 1469 he bought a Josephus and Quintus Curtius for forty ducats. His great Bible in two volumes is said to have cost 1,375 sequins. Rinaldo degli Albizzi notes in his Memoirs that he paid eleven golden florins for a Bible at Arezzo in 1406. Of these manuscripts, the greater part were manufactured in the cloisters.

Another obstacle to the diffusion of learning was the incompetence of the copyists. Petrarch's invective against the professional copyists shows the depth to which the art had sunk. 'Who,' he exclaims, 'will discover a cure for the ignorance and vile sloth of these copyists, who spoil everything and turn it to nonsense? If Cicero, Livy, and other illustrious ancients were to return to life, do you think they would understand their own works? There is no check upon these copyists, selected without examination or test of their capacity.' . . .

It is clear that the first step toward the revival of learning

²⁶ a species of ornamental engraving

²⁷ A ducat was about fifty grains of gold, or about two dollars and a quarter; a sequin was of about the same value and a florin somewhat less. A soldo is a penny. But one professor's pay was only forty ducats a year.

implied three things: first the collection of manuscripts wherever they could be saved from the indolence of the monks; secondly, the formation of libraries for their preservation; and, thirdly, the invention of an art whereby they might be multiplied cheaply, conveniently, and accurately.

From the convent libraries of Italy, from the museums of Constantinople, from the abbeys of Germany and Switzerland, and France, the slumbering spirits of the ancients had to be evoked. The account given by Benvenuto da Imola of Boccaccio's visit to Monte Cassino brings vividly before us the ardor of these first explorers. 'I will relate what my revered teacher, Boccaccio humorously told me. He said that when he was in Apulia, attracted by the celebrity of the convent, he paid a visit to Monte Cassino, whereof Dante speaks. Desirous of seeing the collection of books, which he understood to be a very choice one, he modestly asked a monk—for he was always most courteous in manners—to open the library, as a favor, for him. The monk answered stiffly, pointing to a steep staircase, "Go up; it is open." Boccaccio went up gladly; but he found that the place which held so great a treasure, was without a door or key. He entered, and saw grass sprouting on the windows, and all the books and benches thick with dust. In his astonishment he began to open and turn the leaves of first one tome and then another, and found many and divers volumes of ancient and foreign works. Some of them had lost several sheets; others were snipped and pared all round the text and mutilated in various ways. At length, lamenting that the toil and study of so many illustrious men should have passed into the hands of most abandoned wretches, he departed with tears and sighs. Coming to the cloister, he asked a monk whom he met, why those valuable books had been so disgracefully mangled. He answered that the monks, seeking to gain a few *soldi*, were in the habit of cutting off sheets and making psalters, which they sold to boys. The margins too they manufactured into charms, and sold to women. So then, O man of study, go to and rack your brains: make books that you may come to this.'

The account Poggio gave of his visit to S. Gallen in a Latin letter to a friend is justly celebrated.... 'The Monastery of S. Gallen lies at the distance of some twenty miles from Constance. Thither, then, partly for the sake of amusement and partly of finding books, whereof we heard there was a large collection in the convent, we directed our steps. In the middle of a well-stocked library, too large to catalogue at present we discovered Quintilian,²⁸ safe as yet and sound, though covered with dust, and filthy with neglect and age. The books, you must know, were not housed according to their worth, but were lying in a most foul and obscure dungeon at the very bottom of a tower, a place into which condemned criminals would hardly have been thrust.....'

Printing

About the end of the fourteenth century,²⁹ we find a practice of taking impressions from engraved blocks of wood; sometimes for playing-cards, which were not generally used long before that time, sometimes for rude cuts of saints. The latter were frequently accompanied by a few lines of letters cut in the block. Gradually entire pages were impressed in this manner; and thus began what are called block books, printed in fixed characters, but never exceeding a very few leaves. Of these there exist nine or ten, often reprinted, as it is generally thought between 1400 and 1440. These block books seem to have been all executed in the Low Countries. This mode of printing from blocks of wood has been practised in China from time immemorial.

The invention of printing, in the modern sense, from moveable letters, has been referred by most to Gutenberg, a native of Mentz, but settled at Strasburg. He is supposed to have conceived the idea before 1440, and to have spent the next ten years in making attempts at carrying it into effect, which some assert him to have done in short pieces actually printed from his moveable wooden characters before 1440. But of the existence of these there seems

²⁸ A Latin author, 35-95 A. D., author of *Institutes of Oratory*.

²⁹ Taken from Hallam's *Literature of Europe*.

to be no evidence. Gutenberg's priority is disputed by those who deem Lawrence Costar of Haarlem the real inventor of the art.

It is agreed by all, that about 1450, Gutenberg, having gone to Mentz, entered into partnership with Fust, a rich merchant of that city, for the purpose of carrying the invention into effect, and that Fust supplied him with considerable sums of money.

It is a very striking circumstance, that the high-minded inventors of this great art tried at the very outset so bold a flight as the printing an entire Bible, The Mazarin Bible ³⁰ is printed, some copies on vellum, some on paper of choice quality, with strong, black, and tolerably handsome characters, but with some want of uniformity.

Yet the whole number of books printed with dates of time and place, in the German empire, from 1461 to 1470, according to Panzer, was only twenty-four; of which five were Latin, and two German, Bibles.

We now come to our own Caxton, who finished a translation into English of the *Recueil des histoires de Troye*, at Cologne, in September, 1471. It was probably printed there the next year. But soon afterwards he came to England with the instruments of his art; and his *Game of Chess* a slight and short performance, referred to 1474, though without a date, is supposed to have been the first specimen of English typography.

It has been reckoned³¹ that before the year 1500, 4,987 books were printed in Italy, of which 298 are claimed by Bologna, 300 by Florence, 629 by Milan, 925 by Rome, and 2,835 by Venice.

While scholars rejoiced in the art that, to quote the words of one of them, 'had saved the labor of their aching joints,' the copyists complained that their occupation would be taken from them. But the great nobles did not suddenly transfer their custom from the scribe to the compositor; nor was it to be expected that so essentially a democratic art as printing should find immediate

³⁰ A Bible found in the eighteenth century in the library of Cardinal Mazarin at Paris. Some think it was printed in 1450 or 1452 or 1455.

³¹ We return to Symonds' *Revival of Learning*.

favor with the aristocracy. A prince with a library of manuscripts worth 40,000 ducats hated the machine that put an equal number of more readable volumes within the reach of moderate competency. Ecclesiastics, again, questioned whether the promiscuous multiplication of books was pious. To check the spread of printing would, however, have overtaxed the powers of any human tyranny.

Though the copyists of manuscripts were thrown out of work by the printing press, it gave important stimulus to other industries in Italy. The paper mills became valuable properties; compositors and readers began to form a separate class of artisans, while needy scholars found a market for their talents in the houses of the publishers. When we consider the amount of literary work that had to be performed before the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew texts could be prepared for the press, the difficulty of procuring correct copies of authoritative codices, and the scrupulous attention expended upon proof sheets, we are able to understand that men who lived by learning found the new art profitable.

What was the Renaissance?

The word Renaissance,³² we use to denote the whole transition from the Middle Ages to the Modern World; and though it is possible to assign certain limits to the period during which this transition took place, we cannot fix on any dates so positively as to say—between this year and that the movement was accomplished. To do so would be like trying to name the days on which spring in any particular season began and ended.

If we ask the students of art what they mean by the Renaissance, they will reply that it was the revolution effected in architecture, painting, and sculpture by the recovery of antique monuments. Students of literature, philosophy, and theology see in the Renaissance that discovery of manuscripts, that passion for antiquity, that progress in philology and criticism, which led to new systems of thought, to more accurate analysis, and finally to the emancipation of conscience. Men of science will discourse

³² We quote from John Addington Symonds' *Age of the Despots*.

about the discovery of the solar system by Copernicus and Galileo, the anatomy of Vesalius and Harvey's theory of the circulation of the blood. The origin of a truly scientific method is the point which interests them most in the Renaissance. The political historian, again, has his own answer to the question. The extinction of feudalism, the development of the great nationalities of Europe, the growth of monarchy, the limitation of the ecclesiastical authority and the gradual emergence of that sense of popular freedom which exploded in the Revolution; these interest him. Men whose attention has been turned to the history of discoveries and inventions will relate the exploration of America and the East, or will point to the benefits conferred upon the world by the arts of printing and engraving, by the compass and the telescope, by paper and by gunpowder; and will insist that at the moment of the Renaissance all these instruments of mechanical utility started into existence, to aid in the dissolution of what was rotten and must perish, to strengthen and perpetuate the new and useful and life-giving. Yet neither any one of these answers taken separately, nor indeed all of them together, will offer a solution of the problem. By the term Renaissance, or new birth, is indicated a natural movement, not to be explained by this or that characteristic, but to be accepted as an effort of humanity for which at length the time had come, and in the onward progress of which we still participate.

The arts and the inventions, the knowledge and the books, which suddenly became vital at the time of the Renaissance, had long lain neglected on the shore of the Dead Sea which we call the Middle Ages. It was not their discovery which caused the Renaissance. But it was the intellectual energy, the spontaneous outburst of intelligence, which enabled mankind at that moment to make use of them. The force then generated still continues, vital and expansive, in the spirit of the modern world. The Renaissance was the liberation of the reason from a dungeon, the double discovery of the outer and the inner world.

An external event determined the direction which this out-

burst of the spirit of freedom should take. This was the contact of the modern with the ancient mind which followed upon what is called the Revival of Learning. The fall of the Greek Empire in 1453, while it signalized the extinction of the old order, gave an impulse to the now accumulated forces of the new. The modern genius felt confidence in its own energies when it learned what the ancients had achieved. The guesses of the ancients stimulated the exertions of the moderns. The whole world's history seemed once more to be one.

The great achievements of the Renaissance were the discovery of the world and the discovery of man.³³ Under these two *formulae* may be classified all the phenomena which properly belong to this period. The discovery of the world divides itself into two branches—the exploration of the globe, and that systematic exploration of the universe which is in fact what we call Science. Columbus made known America in 1492; the Portuguese rounded the Cape in 1497; Copernicus explained the solar system in 1507. The world, regarded in old times as the center of all things, the apple of God's eye, for the sake of which were created sun and moon and stars, suddenly was found to be one of the many balls that roll round a giant sphere of light and heat, which is itself but one among innumerable suns attended each by a *cortege* of planets, and scattered, how we know not, through infinity. The reason of man was at last able to study the scheme of the universe, of which he is a part, and to ascertain the actual laws by which it is governed. Three centuries and a half have elapsed since Copernicus revolutionized astronomy. It is only by reflecting on the mass of knowledge we have since acquired, knowledge not only infinitely curious but also incalculably useful in its application to the arts of life, and then considering how much ground of this kind was acquired in the ten centuries which preceded the Renaissance, that we are at all able to estimate the expansive force which was then generated. Science, rescued from the hand of astrology, geomancy, alchemy,

³³ It is to Michelet that we owe these *formulae*, which have passed into the language of history. (Symonds' note).

began her real life with the Renaissance. Since then, as far as to the present moment she has never ceased to grow. Progressive and durable, Science may be called the first-born of the spirit of the modern world.

Savonarola

Savonarola has been claimed as a precursor of the Lutheran Reformers, and as an inspired exponent of the spirit of the fifteenth century. In reality he neither shared the revolutionary genius of Luther, which gave a new vitality to the faiths of Christendom, nor did he sympathize with that free movement of the modern mind which found its first expression in the arts and humanistic studies of Renaissance Italy. Both toward Renaissance and reform he preserved the attitude of a monk, showing on the one hand an austere mistrust of pagan culture, and on the other no desire to alter either the creeds or the traditions of the Romish Church. Yet the history of Savonarola is not to be dissociated from that of the Italian Renaissance.

Girolamo Savonarola was born at Ferrara in 1452. His grandfather Michele, a Paduan of noble family, had removed to the capital of the Este princes at the beginning of the fifteenth century. There he held the office of court physician; and Girolamo was intended for the same profession. But early in his boyhood the future prophet showed signs of disinclination for a worldly life, and an invincible dislike of the court. Under the House of Este, Ferrara was famous throughout Italy for its gayety and splendour. No city enjoyed more brilliant and more frequent public shows. Nowhere did the aristocracy maintain so much of feudal magnificence and chivalrous enjoyment. The square castle of red brick, which still stands in the middle of the town, was thronged with poets, players, fools who enjoyed an almost European reputation, court flatterers, knights, pages, scholars and fair ladies. But beneath its cube of solid masonry, on a level with the moat, shut out from daylight by a sevenfold series of iron bars, lay dungeons in which the objects of the Duke's displeasure

clanked chains and sighed their lives away. Within the precincts of this palace the young Savonarola learned to hate alike the worldly vices and the despotic cruelty against which in after-life he prophesied and fought unto the death.

The attractions of the cloister, as a refuge from the storms of the world, and as a rest from the torments of the sins of others, now began to sway his mind. . . . Girolamo left Ferrara in secret and journeyed to Bologna. There he entered the order of S. Dominic, the order of the Preachers, the order of his master S. Thomas, the order too, let us remember, of inquisitorial crusades.

The career of Savonarola as a preacher began in 1482, when he was sent first to Ferrara and then to Florence on missions by his superiors. But at neither place did he find acceptance. A prophet has no honor in his own country; and for pagan-hearted Florence, though destined to be the theater of his life-drama, Savonarola had as yet no thunderous burden of invective to utter. Besides, his voice was sharp and thin; his face and person were not prepossessing. The style of his discourse was adapted to cloisteral disputations, and overloaded with scholastic distinctions. The great orator had not yet arisen in him. The friar, with all his dryness and severity, was but too apparent. With what strange feelings must the youth have trodden the streets of Florence! In after-days he used to say that he fore-knew those streets and squares were destined to be the scene of his labors. But then, voiceless, powerless, without control of his own genius, without the consciousness of his prophetic mission, he brooded alone and out of harmony with the beautiful and mundane city. The charm of the hills and gardens of Valdarno, the loveliness of Giotto's tower, the amplitude of Brunelleschi's dome—these may have sunk deep into his soul. And the subtle temper of the Florentine intellect must have attracted his own keen spirit by a secret sympathy. For Florence ere long became the city of his love, the first-born of his yearnings.

In the cloisters of San Marco, enriched with splendid libraries by the liberality of the Medicean princes, he was at peace. The

walls of that convent had recently been decorated with frescoes by Fra Angelico, even as a man might crowd the leaves of a missal with illuminations. Among these Savonarola meditated and was happy. But in the pulpit and in contact with the holiday folk of Florence he was ill at ease. Lorenzo de' Medici overshadowed the whole city. Lorenzo, in whom the pagan spirit of the Renaissance, the spirit of free culture, found a proper incarnation, was the very opposite of Savonarola, who had already judged the classical revival by its fruits, and had conceived a spiritual resurrection for his country. At Florence a passionate love of art and learning—the enthusiasm which prompted men to spend their fortunes upon manuscripts and statues, the sensibility to beauty which produced the masterworks of Donatello and Ghiberti, the thirst for knowledge which burned in Pico and Poliziano and Ficino—existed side by side with impudent immorality, religious deadness, cold contempt for truth, and cynical admiration of successful villainy. . . . Who could then have guessed that beneath the cowl of the harsh-voiced Dominican, burned thoughts that in a few years would inflame Florence with a conflagration powerful enough to destroy the fabric of the Medicean despotism?

He was no founder of a new order: unlike his predecessors, Dominic and Francis, he never attempted to organize a society of saints or preachers; unlike his successors, Caraffa the Theatine and Loyola the Jesuit, he enrolled no militia for the defense of the faith, constructed no machinery for education. Starting with simple horror at the wickedness of the world, he had recourse to the old prophets. He steeped himself in Bible studies. He caught the language of Malachi and Jeremiah. He became convinced that for the wickedness of Italy a judgment was imminent. From that conclusion he rose upon the wings of faith to the belief that a new age would dawn. The originality of his intuition consisted in this, that while Italy was asleep, and no man trembled for the future, he alone felt that the stillness of the air was fraught with thunder, that its tranquillity was like that which precedes a tempest.

Lorenzo soon began to resent the influence of this uncom-

promising monk, who, not content with moral exhortations, confidently predicted the coming of a foreign conqueror, the fall of the Magnificent, the peril of the Pope, and the ruin of the King of Naples. Yet it was no longer easy to suppress the preacher. Very early in his Florentine career Savonarola had proved himself to be fully as great an administrator as an orator. The Convent of San Marco dominated by his personal authority, had made him Prior in 1491, and he was already engaged in a thorough reform of all the Dominican monasteries of Tuscany.

He had recognized the oppressor of liberty, the corruptor of morality, the opponent of true religion, in Lorenzo. He hated him as a tyrant. He would not give him the right hand of friendship or the salute of civility. In the same spirit he afterwards denounced Alexander,³⁴ scorned his excommunication, and plotted with the kings of Christendom for the convening of a Council.

From the time of the death of Lorenzo, Savonarola's life is that of a statesman no less than of a preacher. Henceforth he became the champion of popular liberty in the pulpit. Feeling that in the people alone lay any hope of regeneration for Italy, he made it the work of his whole life to give the strength and sanction of religion to republican freedom. This work he sealed with martyrdom.

During the years of 1493 and 1494, when Florence together with Italy was in imminent peril, the voice of Savonarola never ceased to ring. From his pulpit beneath the somber dome of Brunelleschi he kept pouring forth words of power to resuscitate the free spirit of his Florentines. Whatever Savonarola ordained, Florence executed. It was no wonder if, passing as he had done from the discipline of the cloister to the dictatorship of a republic, he should make extravagant mistakes.

The discontent which germinated in Florence displayed itself in Rome. Alexander found it intolerable to be assailed as Anti-christ by a monk who had made himself master of the chief Italian

³⁴ Pope Alexander VI.

republic. At first he used his arts of blandishment and honeyed words in order to lure Savonarola to Rome. The friar refused to quit Florence. Then Alexander suspended him from preaching. Savonarola obeyed. But at the request of the Florentine Republic, though still suffering from the Pope's interdict, he then resumed his preaching. Alexander sought next to corrupt the man he could not intimidate. To the suggestion that a Cardinal's hat might be offered him, Savonarola replied that he preferred the red crown of martyrdom. Ascending the pulpit of the Duomo in 1496, he preached the most fiery of all his Lenten courses.

Very terrific indeed are the denunciations contained in these discourses—denunciations fulminated without disguise against the Pope and priests of Rome, against the Medici, against the Florentines themselves, in whom the traces of rebellion were beginning to appear. All tyrants came in for a share of his prophetic indignation.

Against so great and powerful a host one man could not stand alone. Savonarola's position became daily more dangerous in Florence. At last in March 1498 his staunch friends, the Signory, or supreme executive of Florence, suspended him from preaching in the Duomo. The Compagnacci³⁵ got the upper hand. Saint Mark's convent was besieged, Savonarola was led to prison, never to issue till the day of his execution by the rope and faggot, (May 23, 1498).

Thus died Savonarola: and immediately he became a saint. His sermons and other works were universally distributed. Medals in his honor were struck. Raphael painted him among the Doctors of the Church in the Vatican. The Church, with strange inconsistency, proposed to canonize the man whom she had burned as a heretic and a corruptor of the people. But above all, he lived in the hearts of the Florentines. For many years to come his name was the watchword of their freedom.

³⁵ a band of young aristocrats who opposed Savonarola

Revival of Art

The revival of Sculpture and Painting³⁶ at the end of the thirteenth century was among the earliest signs of that new intellectual birth to which we give the title of Renaissance. . . .

It has been granted only to two nations, the Greeks and the Italians, and to the latter only at the time of the Renaissance, to invest every phase and variety of intellectual energy with the form of art. Nothing notable was produced in Italy between the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries that did not bear the stamp and character of fine art. If the methods of science may be truly said to regulate our modes of thinking at the present time, it is no less true that, during the Renaissance, art exercised a like controlling influence. Not only was each department of the fine arts practiced with singular success; not only was the national genius to a very large extent absorbed in painting, sculpture, and architecture; but the aesthetic impulse was more subtly and widely diffused than this alone would imply. . . .

The speech of the Italians at that epoch, their social habits, their ideal of manners, their standard of morality, the estimate they formed of men, were alike conditioned and qualified by art. It was an age of splendid ceremonies and magnificent parade, when the furniture of houses, the armor of soldiers, the dress of citizens, the pomp of war, and the pageantry of festival were invariably and inevitably beautiful. On the meanest articles of domestic utility, cups and platters, door-panels and chimney-pieces, coverlets for beds and lids of linen-chests, a wealth of artistic invention was lavished by innumerable craftsmen, no less skilled in technical details than distinguished by rare taste. From the Pope upon St. Peter's chair to the clerks in a Florentine counting-house, every Italian was a judge of art. Art supplied the spiritual oxygen, without which the life of the Renaissance must have been atrophied. During that period of prodigious activity the entire nation seemed to be endowed with an instinct for the beautiful, and with the capacity for producing it in every

³⁶ We quote from Symonds' *The Fine Arts*.

conceivable form. As we travel through Italy at the present day, when 'time, war, pillage, and purchase' have done their worst to denude the country of its treasures, we still marvel at the incomparable and countless beauties stored in every burgh and hamlet. Pacing the picture-galleries of Northern Europe, the country-seats of English nobles, and the palaces of Spain, the same reflection is still forced upon us: how could Italy have done what she achieved within so short a space of time? What must the houses and the churches once have been from which these spoils were taken but which still remain so rich in masterpieces? Psychologically to explain this universal capacity for the fine arts in the nation at this epoch is perhaps impossible. Yet the fact remains, that he who would comprehend the Italians of the Renaissance must study their art....

I intend to deal with Italian painting as the one complete product which remains from the achievements of this period, touching upon sculpture and architecture more superficially. Not only is painting the art in which the Italians among all the nations of the world stand unapproachably alone, but it is also the one that best enables us to gauge their genius at the time when they impressed their culture on the rest of Europe. In the history of the Italian intellect, painting takes the same rank as that of sculpture in the Greek....

[We must omit almost entirely the subject of the development of art. A glance at this list of some of the greatest Italian artists of this period reveals the wealth there is to study.

Arnolfo di Cambio, 1232-1300
Giotto, 1276-1337
Ghiberti, 1378-1455
Brunelleschi, 1379-1446
Donatello, 1386-1466
Fra Angelico da Fiesole, 1387-1455
Luca della Robbia, 1400?-1482
Fra Filippo Lippi, 1402?-1469
Giovanni Bellini, 1427-1516
Signorelli, 1441-1523
Perugino, 1446-1524
Botticelli, 1447-1510

Leonardo da Vinci, 1452-1519
Fra Bartolommeo, 1475-1517
Michelangelo Buonarroti 1475-1564
Giorgione, 1477-1511
Titian, 1477?-1576
Raphael, 1483-1520
Andrea del Sarto, 1486-1531
Giulio Romano, 1492-1546
Correggio (Antonio Allegri) 1494-1534
Benvenuto Cellini, 1500-1571
Tintoretto, 1518-1594
Paolo Veronese, 1528-1588.]

XXI—THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION

[One of the evidences of the Renaissance was the awakening of religious thought.

We omit for the present the reformation in England which we shall take up when we turn again to the study of England. Before we take up the subject of the reformation in Germany, we need to glance again briefly at the history of the Church.

When in 311 and 313 A. D. the Roman Empire adopted Christianity, the Christian Church became that of the court, that of the nobles and aristocracy; it of necessity lost some of its genuine simplicity. Heads of the churches, or bishops were called father, Latin *papa*. The *papa* or bishop of the church at Rome was naturally the leading churchman. But it was not until the time of Gregory VII, Bishop of Rome, who died in 1085, that a decree was issued stating that only the Bishop of Rome could be given the title of *Papa*, or Pope.

For the next five hundred years there were frequent struggles between the Popes and other rulers. The popes claimed not only power over the spirits of man but over their material possessions as well.

Every individual was a member of the Church; he had no choice; he was born into it. Every individual was compelled to pay a tax to the church; this was often a tithe, that is a tenth of his income.

Many priests and popes were saintly men. But when we remember how feudalism resulted in the feudal lord's power to put his favorites into positions as heads of monasteries, bishoprics and parishes, we can easily understand that some priests and popes were very wicked men.

Special assignments or topics should take up the subjects: King John of England and the Pope; Henry IV of Germany and the Pope; Frederick I, or Barbarossa, of Germany and the Pope; The Papacy at Avignon, France, 1309-1376; the Evils of Mediaeval Monasticism; Simony; etc. etc. We quote first from Robertson's *History of the Reign of Emperor Charles the Fifth*.

GERMANY IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

In Germany the princes, the great nobility, the dignified ecclesiastics, the free cities . . . claimed and exercised the right of governing their respective territories with full sovereignty. They acknowledged no superior with respect to any point relative to the interior administration and police of their domains. They enacted laws, imposed taxes, coined money, declared war, concluded peace, and exerted every prerogative peculiar to independ-

ent states. The ideas of order and political union, which had originally formed the various provinces of Germany into one body, were almost entirely lost; and the society must have dissolved, if the forms of feudal subordination had not preserved such an appearance of connection or dependence among the various members of the community, as preserved it from falling to pieces.

This bond of union, however, was extremely feeble; and hardly any principle remained in the German constitution, of sufficient force to maintain public order, or even to ascertain personal security. . . .

The political constitution of the German empire, at the commencement of the reign of Charles V. was of a species so peculiar, as not to resemble perfectly any form of government known either in the ancient or modern world. It was a complex body, formed by the association of several states, each of which possessed sovereign and independent jurisdiction within its own territories. Of all the members which composed this united body, the emperor was the head. In his name, all decrees and regulations, with respect to points of common concern, were issued; and to him the power of carrying them into execution was committed. But this appearance of monarchical power in the emperor was more than counterbalanced by the influence of the princes and states of the empire in every act of administration. No law extending to the whole body could pass, no resolution that affected the general interest could be taken, without the approbation of the diet of the empire. In this assembly, every sovereign prince and state of the Germanic body had a right to be present, to deliberate, and to vote. The decrees. . . of the diet were the laws of the empire, which the emperor was bound to ratify and enforce. . . .

The emperors of Germany, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, were distinguished by the most pompous titles, and by such ensigns of dignity, as intimated their authority to be superior to that of all other monarchs. The greatest princes of the empire attended, and served them, on some occasions, as the officers of their household. They exercised prerogatives which no other

sovereign ever claimed. They retained pretensions to all the extensive powers which their predecessors had enjoyed in any former age. But, at the same time, instead of possessing that ample domain which had belonged to the ancient emperors of Germany, and which stretched from Basil to Cologne, along both banks of the Rhine, they were stripped of all territorial property, and had not a single city, a single castle, a single foot of land, that belonged to them, as heads of the empire. As their domain was alienated, their stated revenues were reduced almost to nothing; and the extraordinary aids, which on a few occasions they obtained, were granted sparingly and paid with reluctance. The princes and states of the empire, though they seemed to recognize the Imperial authority, were subjects only in name, each of them possessing a complete municipal jurisdiction within the precincts of his own territories.

From this ill-compacted frame of government, effects that were unavoidable resulted. The emperors, dazzled with the splendour of their titles, and the external signs of vast authority, were apt to imagine themselves to be the real sovereigns of Germany, and were led to aim continually at recovering the exercise of those powers which the forms of the constitution seemed to vest in them, and which their predecessors, Charlemagne and the Othos, had actually enjoyed. The princes and states, aware of the nature as well as extent of these pretensions, were perpetually on their guard, in order to watch all the motions of the Imperial court, and to circumscribe its power within limits still more narrow. The emperors, in support of their claims, appealed to ancient forms and institutions, which the states held to be obsolete. The states founded their rights on recent practice and modern privileges, which the emperors considered as usurpations.

But amidst the violence and anarchy which prevailed for several centuries in the empire, seven princes who possessed the most extensive territories, and who had obtained a hereditary title to the great offices of the state, acquired the exclusive privilege of nominating the emperor. This right was confirmed to them by the Golden Bull: and they were dignified with the title of Electors.

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY

Martin Luther

Martin Luther¹ was completely the child of those deeply agitated times. The home of his family was at Mohra, in Thuringia, and the name of Luther still occurs there. His father, a slate-cutter by trade, had emigrated to the rich mining district of Eisleben to find work, and there Luther came into the world. "I am a peasant's son," he says in his *Table-Talk*; "my father, grandfather, and ancestors were all peasants."

Both parents worked very hard to support their children; the mother, herself carried the wood on her back; the father spent all his life as a poor miner. But notwithstanding his limited means, Luther's father had an ambition to make of his son something better than a miner; he treated him with the greatest severity. "My parents' severity made me timid; their sternness and the strict life they led made me afterwards go into a monastery and become a monk. They meant it well, but they did not understand the art of adjusting their punishments." He did not fare much better at school at Mansfeld, where his parents lived from 1484 to 1497; the teachers behaved to the pupils "like gaolers to thieves."

His religious training was strictly orthodox. If any one had a living faith in the mediaeval Church it was he; this was especially the case when he went from Mansfeld to Magdeburg in 1497.

Magdeburg, with its forty thousand inhabitants, was at that time the largest and most flourishing city in the north of Germany, and as the seat of a bishopric, was the brilliant centre of the Catholic Church in the north. Here too, he witnessed a spectacle which affected him deeply; he saw the son of a German prince, William von Anhalt, whom his father, in an attack of melancholy, had forced to become a monk. Luther saw him "go about the streets in the cowl of a barefooted friar, with a beggar's wallet, begging for bread, and he had been scourged and made to fast and watch until he was the picture of death—nothing but skin and bone.

¹ We quote from Hausser's, *The Period of the Reformation*.

Luther vowed to himself that he would follow in the steps of this Prince of Anhalt. "I was naturally disposed to fast, to watch, to pray, to do good works, that I might thereby expiate my sins." He had already vowed to himself to make a pilgrimage to Rome, and to be religious.

He next went to Eisenach. Here he was dependent for support on alms from strangers. [Here he came to know the Cotta family.]

In 1501 he went to the university. Among the universities of that day Erfurt took the first rank as the seat of Humanistic studies. Lawyers, doctors of medicine, and theologians, all belonged to the new school. The excellent philological teaching, the schools for Greek and Latin, and the new grammatical method, were of great service to Luther; but there is no evidence that he had any inclination to make these studies his profession. He regarded them as means to an end. Besides, his vocation was marked out for him; he was to be a lawyer.

While pursuing these studies, the thought ripened within him that it was not his vocation to follow his father's plans, but to devote himself to theology, and that in the strictest sense of the word. He would enter an order of monks. His resolution gave rise to severe conflicts with his father who had been accustomed to implicit obedience from his son; now, for the first time, Luther declared that he neither could nor would obey, for that his conscience, his salvation, his all were at stake. A separation took place, which Luther could never mention without emotion. The grey-headed old man went away in despair, feeling that his son was lost to him.

Martin Luther joined the Austin Friars in 1505, and earnestly desired, if any one ever did, to be a true monk, and "with tonsure and cowl" by the service of God to earn his soul's salvation. He imposed all sorts of privations on himself, mortified the flesh, passed whole nights in prayer and fasting, and practised all those self-inflicted torments which the Middle Ages were so clever in inventing.

The University of Wittenberg, the creation of Frederic the

Wise, the Elector of Saxony, had been founded in 1502, entirely in the modern Humanistic spirit. Luther was called to it, and arrived there at the close of 1508. At Erfurt he had been entirely the monk who renounces the world. The fire of his character, his talents for writing and speaking, now first came into play. He was not then at all conscious of his powers. For the first few years it was agony for him to ascend the pulpit stairs.

The young teacher and preacher was not only honored, he was almost spoiled by the Elector and the public. The convictions at which he had arrived at Erfurt became clearer and more mature. He now took a wider and more independent view of the doctrine of justification by faith; it was not in contradiction to that of the Church—indeed, he was supported by her great authorities, Paul and Augustine.

In 1510 Luther set out for Rome, either because he was charged with some errand for his order, or to fulfil the vow made while yet a boy. It is not correct to say that this pilgrimage turned him into the bitterest enemy of the Papacy, after being its most devoted adherent. For years after this we find him strictly retaining the same relation to the supreme authority in Christendom which had always been characteristic of him. We learn from him, that, true pilgrim as he was, at the first sight of the eternal city he threw himself upon the ground, and exclaimed, "I greet thee, holy Rome, thrice holy from the blood of the martyrs which has been shed in thee." Keen observer as he was, however, he soon saw more than was good for his veneration, and then, of course, made the observations on the actual state of things at Rome which he afterwards wove into the fearful accusations contained in his writings against Rome, especially in his work addressed to the German nobles; but they did not then change his fundamental views, nor estrange him from the ancient church. Until the beginning of 1517 he lived at Wittenberg, teaching, and preaching.

Indulgences

Between 1509 and 1517 the new Indulgence was proclaimed. There was nothing so very repulsive in the doctrine and practice of indulgence in the ancient Church. Moral repentance was held to be the main thing; but the dangerous addition had been made that outward signs of repentance were pleasing to God. Afterwards release might be obtained from the performance of such signs—fasting, scourging, and going on pilgrimages—by the payment of money, which, however, was not meant to absolve from sin but was considered as a sign of the inward change of mind. But this old doctrine of the Church had been greatly altered, and in the fourteenth century, during the Babylonish exile, financial considerations had been allowed to prevail over moral ones.² “It is most abominable,” said the Germans at Constance who burnt Huss, “the last popes have put a price on sins like shopkeepers’ wares, and have sold remission of sins by means of indulgences for jingling coin!” It ended, however, in a proposition for restrictions upon indulgences; but such a system could not be restricted, it must be abolished. The abuse continued. An urgent appeal was again made to Pope Martin V., who was elected at Constance, to put an end to it; this he agreed to do, but did nothing. It seemed as if all the warnings of the councils were forgotten, and everything that had given most offence was carried to the greatest extent. Thus a tariff of taxes was formed for all manner of sins. In Tetzel’s instructions sacrilege was rated at nine ducats, murder at seven, witchcraft at six, murder of parents or brothers

² Berthold of Regensburg, a churchman, about 1270 wrote: “Fie penny-preacher, thou dost promise so much remission of sins for a mere half-penny or penny that thousands now trust thereto, and fondly dream to have atoned for all their sins with the half-penny or penny, and so go to hell.”

Wyclif in England in the fourteenth century complained that two thousand years of purgatory were saved by a single prayer.

See also Chaucer’s Pardoner.

In 1450, Thomas Gascoigne the great Chancellor, (President), of Oxford wrote: “Sinners say nowadays, ‘I care not how many or how great sins I commit before God, for I shall easily and quickly get plenary remission for any guilt and penalty whatsoever by absolution and indulgence granted to me from the Pope whose writing and grant I have bought for four pence, or six pence, or for a game of tennis.’” (Ency. Brit. Indulgences.)

and sisters, at four. From the time of Innocent VIII you could buy immunity from purgatory, and in 1507 and 1512 Julius II extended indulgence even to heresy.

Between 1500 and 1517 five extraordinary indulgences were proclaimed, and that at a time when men's minds were beginning to be stirred up against them. It was quite incomprehensible. The Church was acting on the shameless principle of the chamberlain of Innocent VIII, who said, "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should *pay* and live." That Germany specially should be laid under contribution on account of her political disruption was felt to be degrading. Still the money that was required, nominally for a war with the Turks, flowed in streams to Rome; the bishops complained that "hundredweights of German coin flew light as feathers over the Alps." It was no wonder that the temporal princes fully sympathized in the displeasure at seeing money going out of the country on so large a scale for no useful purpose whatever.

Luther was not influenced by these external reasons. A faith had grown up within him which was utterly at variance with the principle of this outrage. The grounds on which others opposed it lay on the surface; his resistance to it came from the depths of his soul.

In 1517, John Tetzel, appeared in Central Germany as a dealer in indulgences under the protection of the Elector Albert of Mayence.

From Frederic the Wise, he found no favor. He set up his shop at Leipzig and in surrounding places, and thus came into Luther's immediate neighborhood. Luther was seized with indignation. He had already admonished some of the bishops to do their duty by taking measures against this abuse, he had publicly thundered against it in the pulpit, when on October 31st he affixed to the church-door at Wittenberg, his ninety-five theses against Tetzel's doctrine of indulgences. In these he unfolded his views of true repentance; they did not express the least enmity to the Pope, but were so much the more bitter against "the Indulgence

preacher's shameless and wanton words" which he strictly distinguished from the doctrine of the Church. The Theses made a deep impression in Germany.

An accusation was brought against Luther at Rome. Hot-headed people thought that sentence of excommunication must follow. But this, Leo X declined to pronounce. It was one of the tragical links in the chain of the history of the Church at this momentous period that a man was at her head who was personally entirely a stranger to the great questions which agitated her. He looked down upon the squabbles of the people with the princely contempt of the Medicis, never suspecting that they might give rise to a conflagration which might reach his triple crown. His desire was to see them peaceably settled.

A Diet was convened at Augsburg. The Papal Legate had a number of demands for money to make at it. If Rome took severe measures against a German monk who was in favor with an influential prince like Frederic the Wise, the members of the Diet might oppose a levy of Church taxes. The Cardinal Legate Cajetan was therefore commissioned to get the question settled with as little disturbance as possible. He was to send for the monk, talk it over with him, and try to persuade him not to make any further disturbance, and thus put an end to this controversy.

The Legate does not seem to have carried out the papal commission very strictly; he certainly did not act the part of a kindly diplomat, but that of a proud spiritual prince, for whom it was a great condescension to enter at all into discussion with an insignificant monk. At first Luther was constrained and embarrassed, but as the discussion gradually took the form of a theological disputation, he grew warm and bold, and Cajetan declared that he felt quite awe-stricken in his presence. "I could hardly look the man in the face, such a diabolical fire darted out of his eyes."

Thus failed the first attempt to settle the business by diplomacy. This was in October, 1518. Luther fled from Augsburg by night, fearing, and not without reason, for his personal safety; he

rode hastily through by-ways back to Wittenberg, and the controversy continued. Leo was still of opinion that the time was not come for extreme measures, and a second attempt was therefore made.

Carl von Miltitz, a native of Saxony, an adroit man of the world, was now selected to settle the difficulty. It was the Pope's custom on New Year's Day to present one of the most eminent princes with a consecrated golden rose. This year the Elector Frederic of Saxony was to have it, the man who had founded the modern Humanist university of Wittenberg, and who undoubtedly favored Luther. The Nuncio, Miltitz, was to be the bearer of it, and to take the opportunity of seeing Luther, as if accidentally, and to repeat the attempt made by Cajetan.

Miltitz arrived at the beginning of January, 1519, and entered upon his task with great skill. He said he was astonished to find the celebrated doctor a young and vigorous man, instead of an old theologian, and that he would not undertake to conduct him to Rome with twenty-five thousand armed men, for he had observed everywhere that for every adherent of the Pope, Luther had three; he himself was entirely of Luther's mind. Having thus, as he thought, gained his opponent's confidence, he proceeded with his plan. He told Luther that it did not become him, an isolated monk, to carry on a contest like this with the Pope single-handed. He had occasioned his Holiness much uneasiness, and it was his duty to make amends.

A formal agreement was entered into; and it is significant that the Romish Church already, to a certain extent, stipulates with the simple Augustine monk as one power with another. Luther's silence was to be dependent on the silence of others, and he declared that he would retract when refuted—not before.

The armistice, however, was interrupted by a zealot of the Church herself. In March, 1519, Eck proclaimed a great discussion at Leipzig. Some of the theses were aimed at Carlstadt, who was invited as an opponent. But when they were more narrowly examined, it was evident that they were really intended for Luther,

not Carlstadt. This was a virtual though not a formal breach of the armistice. Luther declared at once that he was released from his promise.

The celebrated discussion at Leipzig began on June 27th, 1519. Eck, Luther, Melancthon and Carlstadt appeared with their friends. There seemed to be a feeling that it was not an ordinary scholastic tournament, but that questions of world-wide importance were at issue.

Among other questions Eck referred to the councils of the Church. At Constance, for example, the papal supremacy had been acknowledged. Did Luther no longer adhere to the authority of the councils? The council had condemned Huss³ and his theses: did he hold that the judgment was just or not? Luther considered for a moment, and then said he thought that the council had condemned propositions of Huss that were entirely Christian and evangelical. This occasioned great excitement, and Eck answered: "Then, worthy father, you are to me a heathen man and a publican."

From this time any attempt to hush the matter up was quite vain. Luther did not retreat even when he expected to share the fate of Huss.

The favor of the nation increased in proportion as Luther's defection was decisive. He had never been weaker than when negotiating with Miltitz—never stronger than after the discussion. All the Humanist party, then the dominant party among the learned men of the day, and among them the best spirits of the nation, were on his side. The young men who had hitherto regarded the contest with quiet indifference or contempt, now began to take an interest in it, and to show that they did so. Ulrich von Hutten openly joined Luther's cause. Hutten was the most elegant, most polished member of the younger school of the Humanists. He had been crowned by the Emperor as the first

³John Huss, born July 6, 1369, a religious reformer of Bohemia, was burned at the stake at Constance, Baden, July 6, 1415. A papal bull or edict was so-called from the *bull*a or round leaden seal affixed to it.

German poet. He was the impersonation of the Humanistic spirit. Before this Philip Melancthon had joined Luther, and was invaluable as a complement to him. Then he was more cultivated than the Thuringian peasant's son, and his manners were more polished.

The discussion was also a turning-point for Luther in his studies. He now studied the history of the Church, more particularly its history in recent times. He made acquaintance, during the excitement in which the discussion had left him, with the stormy councils of the fifteenth century; he saw how nearly the nation had seen her hopes of reform realised, and how shamefully she had been deceived. It made a deeper impression upon him than it could ever have done before, but still it cost him some pain to tear himself entirely away from the ancient Church....

In June, 1520, Luther's address "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation" came out. Although but a few pages, it was the work of an agitator, and written in Luther's most masterly style. Its main proposition is that the Romish Curia must be resisted, and the walls which it had built around Germany thrown down, and that it would especially become the German nobility to take the lead in the conflict. The address produced great excitement; it was useless now to think of silencing the bold monk; but whether it was wise for the Pope to have recourse to the last resort, and excommunicate him, at the risk of its taking no effect, was the great question.

Eck, Luther's literary opponent, was guilty of the indiscretion of bringing to Germany the bull which the Pope had reluctantly issued. It was received with open repugnance, or at least with indifference; some governments were reluctant to proclaim it, others declared that in the existing state of things it was not necessary to obey it: they appealed to their own judgments against the Church in true modern fashion.

The Elector Frederic the Wise openly disclaimed obedience to the bull; the university of Wittenberg decidedly took the part of Luther and Carlstadt, which encouraged Luther to venture on

the unheard-of step which he took on the 10th December, 1520. . . . He resolved to take the monstrous step of publicly burning the papal bull in the presence of the professors, the students, and the citizens of Wittenberg.

On December 10th the solemn procession, to which Luther had invited the people by a notice on the church door, went through Elstergate; and the people looked on while the bull, whose predecessors had dethroned many a proud emperor, and condemned many a good reformer to the flames, was consumed in the fire, amidst the blank amazement of the Romanists and the rejoicings of Luther's adherents.

Luther had shown that, without incurring danger to himself, he could hold up the Pope's last missile to derision. Rome had exhausted her weapons; admonition, warning, advice, ban,—not one of them had produced the least effect. The greater the dismay at Rome, the greater had been the monk's audacity, the more numerous his followers. But one resource was left—the temporal power.

The Diet of Worms, 1521

The young Emperor, Charles V,⁴ now came to Germany for the first time to arrange the details of the election contract at the Diet, and at the same time to speak the decisive word on the question of Church reform. This latter task was peculiarly difficult. On the one hand, the unity of the Catholic Church must be maintained, yet the abuses within her must be remedied.

The court was conducted with great pomp. On the first day of his speaking, April 17, 1521, the style of Luther's defence was

⁴ Maximilian I of Austria, of the House of Hapsburg, was Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire from 1493 to 1519. His wife Mary of Burgundy inherited Burgundy and the Netherlands. Their son Philip I married Joanna the daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile. Their son Charles, born 1500, was therefore heir to the Austrian possessions; Burgundy and the Netherlands; Aragon, the kingdom of Naples, Sicily and Sardinia; Castile, Navarre and Granada and the Spanish possessions in America and Africa. He was elected Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in 1519, even though Francis I, King of France had sought the honor and Pope Leo X had opposed Charles.

embarrassed. The sight of this great assemblage of dignitaries of the empire and Church abashed the monk. He spoke low, often scarcely intelligibly; and it was not till near the close of the second hearing that he regained facility of utterance and the full power of his voice.⁵ The Spaniards present could not comprehend how so insignificant an individual should have caused such a scandal in Germany, and Charles V, exclaimed, "The monk would not make a heretic of me."

The rest of the Diet was occupied with transactions of a different kind and it did not appear as if any steps would be taken about the heresy, when on the 25th of May, the Emperor had the princes who were still present suddenly summoned, to submit for their approval the decree which had been prepared concerning Luther. The decree, dated May 8, was signed by the Emperor on the 26th of May, and pronounced upon Luther, his friends, followers, and patrons, a sentence of ban and double ban, and condemned his works to be burned. Safe-conduct was granted to Luther for twenty days after his departure: after this, it was forbidden under severe penalties "to give the aforesaid Luther house or home, food, drink, or shelter, to afford him help or countenance, openly or secretly, by words or actions." In conclusion, measures were taken against the printing and printers of his works.

The Lutheran heresy was to be exterminated by all the weapons of the temporal power, so it was stated in the edict of the 26th of May. But the edict shared the fate of the papal bull. Nobody heeded it....

When Luther left Worms, before sentence was pronounced, he was seized by the vassals of Frederic the Wise and taken to Wartburg. In taking this precautionary measure, which Luther does not seem at first to have understood, the Elector was providing against the possibility of things coming to the worst. In the mood in which Germany then was, Luther had in reality little

⁵ "But his bearing was thoroughly firm and unyielding. He maintained that nothing but the plain words of Holy Scripture, no threat, nor power should induce him to recant, and exclaimed, 'Here I stand; I can do no otherwise; God help me! Amen'." (Hausser.)

to fear; no one had any inclination to employ the temporal power to enforce the Edict of Worms. If Luther could not set foot in the enemy's country, he could remain at home without danger. Nevertheless, it was prudent that he should be withdrawn for a time from the eyes of the world.

He set himself, in the Wartburg, to a task which was the most important of all his labours; he began the translation of the Bible for the German people.

The idea of a translation into the vernacular was not a new one. A considerable number of German translations of the Bible might be mentioned; they have all become bibliographical curiosities, and nothing is known of their influence upon the nation. Luther's translation, on the contrary, is a historical event....

Luther took incredible pains. Few of his readers know by what hard work the task was accomplished. We still have some of his translation in MS. He often struck out a passage as many as fifteen times, until he had found the right expression; and this when he was wrestling with his own tongue. But what difficulties he must have encountered in Greek and Hebrew....

The New Testament, which was finished in 1523, was comparatively easy; he found the Old far more difficult, and it was not completed till ten years afterwards. He was assisted by a whole consistory of learned men, who.... "just like a private Sanhedrim, met for several hours before supper every week".... Luther once wrote, when among this circle, "We are working very hard to bring out the Prophets in the mother tongue. Good God! what a great and difficult work it is to make the Hebrew writers speak German!..."

Up to this time it had been the opinion of the Humanists that you could only thus express yourself in Greek and Latin. Luther taught them that German prose might be written which was not put to shame by the languages of antiquity....

It also involved a most important step in the progress of modern Christendom. The Scriptures were taken out of the hands of a privileged priesthood, and given to the people in a popular

form intelligible to every man. The most unnatural of the barriers between the Church and the people was broken down, and the idea realised of the universal priesthood of all....

It would have been all the same for Germany if the Edict of Worms had not been pronounced, for nothing like the execution of it worth mentioning occurred anywhere.... Luther's books, as well as his followers, were to have been annihilated with fire or sword; but, instead of this, they were spread far and wide. All the literature of the period, with very little exception, takes the Lutheran side. Finally, the outlaw ventured out of his hiding-place into the world again; and we do not find that it was ever suggested to the Elector to recapture and punish him. ...

The Diet of Nuremberg, 1523

The new Imperial Chamber, in which the German States ruled in place of the absent Emperor, only represented the prevailing sentiments of the people, by not only not persecuting Luther, but by increasingly adopting his cause, and by in fact, though not in words, revoking the edict of 1521.

The new pope, Adrian VI. (January, 1522–September, 1523), regarded the abuses in the Church with the eye of a strictly moral monk; yet, as an orthodox Dominican, he abhorred Luther's proceedings, and sent a Nuncio to Germany to demand, as he certainly was entitled to do, the execution of the ban pronounced at Worms. But the Committee of the Imperial Chamber declined to comply, because they did not wish to appear "as if they would put down evangelical truth by tyranny, and maintain unchristian abuses, which would only result in resistance to the rulers, insurrection, and defection."

The Papal Legate had to renounce all idea of accomplishing anything with this Diet. The Edict of Worms was thereby reversed; the condemnation of Luther and his followers retracted; the sword of the secular power which had been hanging over him was withdrawn, and free scope was given to his propaganda.

The Peasants' War 1525

That which occasioned so fearful an outbreak in the winter of 1524-1525 had long been fermenting in the blood of the people. None of the abuses by means of which the rulers, the ecclesiastical proprietors and the nobles, oppressed the peasants, had been abolished. Some partial rebellions had met with the usual fate of such attempts; they occasioned the reins to be drawn still tighter. Then with the increase of luxury, the demands on the peasantry, the beasts of burden of society, had greatly increased.

The Reformation was not the exciting cause of the commotions among the peasantry. It is certain, however, that under its influence the commotions assumed a different character. It was quite intelligible that the Reformers should understand the gospel in a purely spiritual sense; but it was also intelligible that the peasants, in their pitiful condition, should prefer to take it literally. When the Scriptures were in their hands, when they found in this simple and popular book a number of sayings which seemed favorable to their cause, it appeared as if they had found an organ, and their spokesmen could say, "We ask nothing but what is promised by the founders of the Christian religion, and we are supported in our demands by the Scriptures."

It was not at first the intention of the peasants to use violence: they rather meant to obtain concessions by resolutions at great meetings, and by popular demonstrations. Their opponents promised redress: courts of arbitration should be established, and improvements adopted; but this was only a feint.

In February and March, 1525, the revolt broke out everywhere simultaneously. Before Luther had declared himself, the masses counted on him as their leader, or reckoned at least on his silent approval. His reply to the Twelve Articles of the Swabian peasants was an exhortation to peace: he endeavored to moderate the peasants, but at the same time reminded the princes and nobles of their old and manifold wrong doings. But writing could do no good in this case; the peasants thought him lukewarm, and the princes and nobles considered him too unfavorable to them.

The storm now broke wildly over palaces, churches, and convents. Luther was then stirred up, and wrote his second paper "against the rapacious and murderous peasants." He stormed against the shameful deeds of the rebels, and was so far carried away as to call upon the authorities to "stab, kill, and strangle," them without mercy. This could but do harm: the authorities were already so exasperated that he should have urged moderation upon them.

The part that Luther took against the movement had very decisive results; the great body of the middle class, which had been undecided before, now received their watchword. Those upon whose sympathies the peasants had counted took no part; the rest prepared for armed resistance. The peasants experienced the usual consequences of an unsuccessful revolt in their worst form: the vanquished party were inhumanly punished, and the oppression against which they had rebelled became greater than ever. The Peasants' War not only did nothing for the class who originated it; it occasioned a great schism in the nation, injured the great cause of reform, and quenched men's interest in politics for a long time to come.

It cannot be denied that the position of the adherents of the new doctrine was by no means safe or enviable. They had taken advantage of the decree of 1526,⁶ which, however, was no decree at all; and the question was whether the Emperor would not reverse it as soon as it was in his power to do so.

In the year 1529 one blow quickly followed another: first, a dispatch from the Emperor, in which he coolly referred to the Edict of Worms of 1521, as if nothing fresh had happened since; then the altered attitude of the Diet; the reconciliation between the Emperor and the Pope, which had been publicly confirmed; and finally the return of the Emperor himself, who now came as a mighty ruler, who had been most successful in war, had twice humbled France, had conquered and then restored Italy, and who

⁶ Given at Spire; that in the matter of religion and the Edict of Worms "every state shall live, rule, and believe so that it shall be ready to answer for itself before God and his Imperial Majesty."

now, in the height of his power and flower of his age, was justified in imagining that he had but to command to attain all that he desired.

The first signs of the change were the imperial warnings that in the spring the Emperor would conclude peace, and put the penalties in force against Luther and his followers. This was accompanied by threats or flattery according to the circumstances; the smaller states were threatened, and a tone of respect adopted towards the larger.

The Diet of Spire

On the 21st of February, 1529, the Diet assembled at Spire.

The Emperor's plan was contained in an advice, the purport of which was as follows:—The edict of 1521 is to be held still in force; the later ones, especially that of 1526, as null and void. Peace, which an attempt had been made to purchase by concessions, had not been secured, nor any restriction put upon the spread of the new doctrine; it was therefore best to return to the edict of 1521, which had been illegally departed from. This was the decided proposal of the imperial commissioner on the 15th of March.....

The final decree enacted, in accordance with the Emperor's advice, that "whoever has hitherto acted on the edict shall continue to do so. In those districts where it has not been observed no further innovations shall be made, and no one shall be prevented from celebrating mass....."

On the 19th of April 1529, the followers of the new doctrine entered a protest⁷ against the final decree of the Diet; on the 22nd an appeal; and in both cases they took their stand upon the modern principle that religious matters could not be decided by majority and minority, but only by conscience. They desire that the decree of 1526 shall be held valid, for otherwise peace can scarcely be maintained. They cannot approve adherence to the Edict of Worms, because they would thereby condemn their own

⁷ From which came the words Protestants.

doctrines. They are ready to render obedience to the Emperor in all things wherein it is due, but these are things "which concern the glory of God and the salvation of the soul of every one of us, and in which, according to God's commands, and for the sake of our own consciences, it is our bounden duty, before all things, to have respect to the Lord our God;" and they hope the Emperor "will kindly excuse this refusal." The decree of Spire of 1526 can only, "in accordance with propriety, reason, and law, be annulled by a unanimous resolution, and such this was not; but apart from that, in matters relating to the glory of God and the salvation of our souls, every one of us must stand before and give account of himself to God."

This protest was signed by John of Saxony, George of Brandenburg, Ernest of Lüneburg, Philip of Hesse, Wolfgang of Anhalt; and then by the representatives of fourteen cities—Strasburg, Nuremberg, Ulm, Costnitz, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St. Gall, Weissenburg, and Windsheim.

The position of affairs was materially aggravated by this step. If the dreaded alliance now took place between the great powers and the Pope, the gravest and most alarming complications must be looked for. The Emperor made himself ready to advance with an army to Germany. He had just assured himself at Barcelona and Cambray of the assistance of the Pope and the King of France, when the capital of his Austrian dominions was menaced by the most powerful army of Turks that had ever been seen on the Danube....

It was an anxious moment, not only for the Emperor, but for all the West. However little credit might be given to the Turks for power to do much permanent mischief in the invaded countries, yet the danger of seeing the culture of the West even temporarily overrun by the Eastern barbarians was quite enough to throw all that divided Christendom into the shade, and, menaced by a common enemy, to cause it to unite its forces for a vigorous resistance.

The terrible danger was averted by the heroic defence of Vienna, and by the noble enthusiasm by which, in spite of ecclesiastical schisms, Germany was animated. . . .

Everything had been propitious to Charles the Fifth. By a successful campaign he had obtained peace with the Pope and the King of France. He had vanquished the greatest military power in Europe; the laurels of Francis I. had faded before the martial glory of the young Emperor; the Grand Turk, after some brilliant successes at first, had hastily retreated, and now Charles V was only opposed by the handful of German princes and cities who had protested at Spire in 1529.

They were, it was true, resolved to sacrifice everything to their convictions; but how insignificant did their power appear compared with that of the Emperor! . . .

Then came (1530) the Diet of Augsburg. Germany had not witnessed so brilliant a one for centuries. The German empire shone once more in its medieval splendour. And how different was the Emperor's arrival now from that when he came up the Rhine to Worms! He was then known only as Maximilian's grandson; now the world was ringing with his exploits. Twice he had humbled the pride of the conqueror of Marignano, he had compelled both Francis and the Pope to enter into treaty with him, his generals and statesmen had been everywhere victorious, and the glory of their deeds was reflected upon him. It was perfectly natural that in the pride of these successes, and after France and Italy had submitted to him, he should imagine that he could adjust the affairs of Germany with a word.

He made his entry into Augsburg with extraordinary pomp. He was not fond of show in general, but this time he wanted to dazzle men's eyes. He wished that both friend and foe should feel that he was Emperor; that, in the old sense of the word, he was ruler of the world and guardian of the Church; and when he was solemnly brought in by the princes of the empire who had loyally gone forth to meet him, his first act was to summon to his presence the protesting princes of Saxony, Brandenburg, Lüneburg, and Hesse.

In a not unfriendly, but very decided tone, he informed them through his brother that the toleration of the Lutheran preaching and the observance of the modern forms of worship must cease; the rest would follow. He had no idea that it would not suffice to issue this command. . . .

Frederic the Wise had been foremost among the promoters of the election of Charles as emperor; his successor John, and Philip of Hesse, had distinguished themselves by their zealous and faithful services against the Turks; and the old Margrave, George of Brandenburg-Ansbach, had grown grey in the Emperor's service, whom, with the dutiful spirit of a vassal, he always regarded as his supreme lord. Nothing but the gravest questions of conscience could induce such men to resist their imperial master.

They unanimously declared, and as decidedly as he had demanded obedience, that they could not obey; these were matters of conscience, and in matters of conscience the Emperor's mandate had no power. The Landgrave Philip began at once to prove the doctrine of justification by faith from St. Augustine and the New Testament, but that was an aspect of the business with which the Emperor was not at home, and he impatiently and angrily interrupted him by reiterating his command. The aged Margrave of Brandenburg then threw himself on his knees before him, and exclaimed, "I would sooner lose my head than God's Word."

This moved the Emperor deeply. His well-known answer, "Dear Prince, no heads off" (*Lieber Fürst, nicht Köpfe ab*), implies that he shuddered at the precipices to which this path might lead him.

Thus the first assault, which he had hoped would have been enough to intimidate the princes, was repulsed; the Lutheran service was solemnly celebrated in the quarters, so called, of the princes and the lodgings of the wealthy patricians; and when, on the following day, there was a procession of the festival of Corpus Christi, the protesting princes declined the invitation to attend it. So little had the Emperor been able to accomplish with the professors of the new doctrine, even with his personal presence and all the pomp of his retinue.

The Emperor then desired that an abstract of the differences between the two doctrines should be laid before him; and in a very short time a statement of the doctrinal differences was handed to the Emperor, June 25, 1530. This was afterwards called the Confession of Augsburg.

But the negotiations set on foot by the Emperor did not lead to any reconciliation; the most favorable terms he could propose were that until he should arrange the promised council with Rome, the Protestants should submit to the Pope!

The final decree of the Diet stated, with offensive severity, that the Protestants would have till the next spring to consider whether they would voluntarily return; and the Emperor added that if they did not accept this decree, measures must be taken for the extermination of this sect without delay.

Under the impression of these threats, at Christmas, 1530, the Protestant princes assembled for conference at Schmalkald. It resulted in the formation of the armed League of Schmalkald in March 1531.

But the execution of the decree of the Diet did not take place. The peace with France showed itself to be more than insecure; the Turks were preparing to avenge their disgrace of 1529; the Emperor's hereditary foes were busy both in the East and in the West. Thus everything concurred to incline him to peace.

[We omit the dissensions and wars between 1530 and 1555. Luther died in 1546.]

Late in the autumn of 1555, the peace which had been promised was concluded at Augsburg. It conceded the legal right of the two churches to exist side by side, and thus broke through the mediaeval Church system.

[Special topics: Just how broad was the Peace of Augsburg? The Council of Trent—how many years was it in meeting? What did it accomplish?

Pupils will enjoy reading *The Friar of Wittenberg*, by William Stearns Davis; if they are a little patient they will like *The Cloister and the Hearth* by Charles Reade, and perhaps *Chronicles of the Schoenberg-Cotta Family* by Mrs. Charles.]

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND

Huldreich or Ulrich Zwingli 1484-1531

[Zwingli was born in the canton of St. Gall, Switzerland. He became a Humanist; entered the Church, and in 1516 began to preach "the Gospel"; like Erasmus he hoped that the Church might reform itself, from within. But he opposed the great pilgrimages to Rome and the sale of indulgences. Through his influence Samson, a seller of indulgences, was forbidden to enter the city of Zurich. Zwingli seems to have arrived at his own conclusions without being influenced by Luther. In 1531 in a civil conflict between the Catholic and Protestant cantons of Switzerland, Zwingli was killed.]

John Calvin 1509-1564

Calvin was younger than Luther and Zwingli by almost the term of human life, and was a child when the first reform movements began in Germany and Switzerland.

He knew nothing of the suffering during childhood by which Luther was schooled and hardened, and was likewise a stranger to the bitter spiritual conflicts through which Luther passed in his youth. Calvin made acquaintance with the modern classical culture at the best French schools, received excellent instruction in Greek and Latin, and was well prepared for the technical study of law. He was in possession of a scholarship from his fourteenth year, had pursued a variety of studies at Paris and Bourges, and was to complete them at Orleans. But here, as with Luther at Erfurt, a change took place within him. He began to study the Scriptures and the German reformers, and in a few years the transformation was complete, for he never did anything by halves.

The case was very different in France from what it was in Germany. There, various influences were at work; though the Emperor was opposed to the new doctrines, the nation was for the most part in favor of them, and their spread was increased by this schism. Heretical tendencies did exist in France, but the temporal power, in close alliance with Rome, did all in its power to stifle them in the bud. Calvin very soon had to fly from France,

for even the protection afforded him by some influential people could not be permanent. He saw that those around him who professed the same doctrines were burnt. On the advice of his friends, therefore, he went abroad, visited Italy and Germany, and passed some time at Strasburg and Basle. Here he produced his first great work, and a most remarkable work it is, one of the ripest products of the age, though written at a time when the first foundations of the Reformation were already laid. It was the "*Institutio Christianae Religionis*," which appeared in 1536.

The book was afterwards translated into French. It was the first important archive in French prose in the sixteenth century, and it has had an immense influence upon the literature of the nation. Calvin's prose formed a real epoch in France....

Geneva had been from ancient times one of the most flourishing imperial cities of the Burgundian territory; it was situated on the frontiers of several countries where the cross roads of various nationalities met. . . . Geneva was apparently in a state of political, ecclesiastical, and moral decay. With the puritanical strictness of Geneva, as it afterwards became, before the mind's eye, it is difficult to picture the Geneva of that day. An unbridled love of pleasure, a reckless wantonness, a licentious frivolity had taken possession of Genevan life, while the State was the plaything of intestine and foreign feuds....

Calvin's greatness was shown in the fanatical zeal with which he entered the city, ready to stake his life for his cause. He began to teach, to found a school, to labour on the structure which was the idea of his life, to introduce reforms in doctrine, worship, the constitution and discipline of the Church, and he preached with that powerful eloquence only possessed by those in whom character and teaching are in unison. The purified worship was to take place within bare, unadorned walls; no picture of Christ, nor pomp of any kind, was to disturb the aspirations of the soul. Life outside the temple was also to be a service of God; games, swearing, dancing, singing, worldly amusements, and pleasure were regarded by him as sins, as much as real vice and crime. He began to form

little congregations, like those in the early ages of the Church, and it need scarcely be said that even in this worldly and pleasure-loving city the apparition of this man, in the full vigour of life, all conviction and determination, half prophet and half tribune, produced a powerful impression.

The number of his outward followers increased, but they were outward followers only. Most of them thought it would be well to make use of the bold Reformer to oppose the bishop, and that he would find means of establishing a new and independent Church, but they seemed to regard freedom as libertinism. Calvin therefore regarded the course things were taking with profound dissatisfaction; he was quite indifferent to the increasing number of his followers, if they continued as worldly as before, if his strict discipline did not take root, and if, in spite of well-filled churches, things went on as before, as though his teaching concerned only the outward man.

So he delivered some extremely severe sermons, which half frightened and half estranged his hearers; and at Easter, 1538, when the congregation came to partake of the Lord's Supper, he took the unheard-of step of sending them all back from the altar, saying, "You are not worthy to partake of the Lord's body; you are just what you were before; your sentiments, your morals, and your conduct are unchanged."

This was more than could be hazarded without peril to his life. The effect was indescribable; his own friends disapproved of the step. But that did not dismay him. He had barely time to flee for his life, and he had to leave Geneva in a state of transition—a chaos which justified a saying of his own, that defection from one Church is not renovation by another. He was now once more an exile.

But a time came when they wished him back at Geneva. With the beginnings of the Calvinistic transformation, the foundations were laid of greater liberty in municipal life, but this was again endangered; it seemed as if morality and liberty would perish together. There was for three years a tumult of party strife,

and it was plain that Geneva would be lost if, having forsaken the old Church, she refused to belong to the new. These were years of bitter trial. Calvin compared them to the time when the Lord's people were in the wilderness. But a great triumph was in store for him, for the people were soon saying with one voice, "Let us recall the man who wished to renovate our faith, our morals, and our liberties." An urgent request was preferred to him to return and to become lawgiver of the city.

In September, 1541, he returned, and set to work to found an ecclesiastical state in which religion, public life, government, and the worship of God were to be all of a piece; and an extraordinary task it was. Calvinistic Geneva became the school of reform for western Europe, and scattered far and wide the germs of similar institutions. In times when Protestantism had become cool, this school carried on the conflict with the mediaeval Church.

Calvin was implacable in his determination to purify the worship of God of all needless adjuncts. All that was calculated to charm and affect the senses was abolished; spiritual worship should be independent of all earthly things, and should consist of edification by the word, and simple spiritual songs.

He was not only a dictator in his republic, but a power in Europe. His influence may be seen by his correspondence. He wrote to Margaret of Valois; wrote opinions in detail for the young King Edward VI. of England; corresponded with Bullinger, Melancthon, Knox; gave counsel to Coligny, Condé, Jeanne D'Albret, the Duchess of Ferrara. In Geneva he was like a Samuel, before whom all prostrated themselves; in his letters we observe the modest tone of the simple clergyman, and yet the conscious pride of the man who had been true to his convictions. His position was a regal and commanding one.

Still he had something of the passion and excitability which characterize his countrymen. Though he possessed great self-control, and was generally calm and cold, yet when opposite opinions were broached to those which ruled his life, his rage vented itself in fearful storms; the hierach, the reformed pope,

the Old Testament prophet, in him broke out, crushing all that came in his way; mostly, however, he was temperate, and even conciliatory, to his opponents.

His treatment of Servetus is a case in point. Servetus honestly held an opposite theological opinion, and defended it with the zeal of a martyr, and Calvin had him burnt as heretics were burnt in the Middle Ages. This is the darkest spot in his life, and nothing can efface it.

To explain his power we must view his character as a whole. The republic which he governed had, before his time, been frivolous and dissolute; it now became a pattern of gloomy puritanical strictness. He ruled by his irreproachable life, by the majesty of his unselfishness, but also by the crushing weight of his irresistible will, and, in case of need, by the terrors of fanaticism. His Christian republic was a theocracy after the pattern of the Old Testament; he did not want the Church to rule the State nor the State the Church; the State was so entirely to comprehend the Church that the boundary line between them should disappear. It was plain that a system like this could only be carried out, even in a small State, by the moral power of an exceptionally energetic individual will. Calvin solved this great problem in the period between 1541-61, and at the end of nearly three centuries the system remained in the same grooves—the stamp which he impressed upon the people was uneffaced, and more than a century after his death the features of the Geneva school were plainly distinguishable.

No other reformer established so rigid a church discipline. The moral police took account of everything. Every citizen had to be at home by nine o'clock, under heavy penalties. Adultery, which had previously been punished by a few days' imprisonment and a small fine, was now punished by death; an adulteress was actually drowned in the Rhone, and two adulterers beheaded. It was forbidden to swear even at animals. A child that had abused its mother was put upon bread and water; another that had thrown stones at its mother, was publicly whipped and hung

up to the gallows by its arms; and one that had struck its parents was executed. Sensual sins were generally punished by drowning; singing profane songs, by banishment; a woman was publicly whipped for singing a worldly song to a psalm tune, and an educated man who was caught reading Poggio's licentious tales, imprisoned; any one found playing cards was condemned to stand in the pillory with the cards round his neck. The ancient festivities at weddings were entirely done away with; no drums or music were allowed in the processions, no dancing at the feast. The theatre was interdicted except when Biblical scenes were represented; novel reading was entirely forbidden, and if any one wrote anything objectionable he was sent to prison.

Thus the Reformed Church discipline was carried out with the same consistency and rigidity as in the old monastic life, and the consequences of so unnatural a state of things were not unknown in this case.

At a time when Europe had no solid results of reform to show, this little State of Geneva stood up as a great power; year by year it sent forth apostles into the world; who preached its doctrines everywhere, and it became the most dreaded counterpoise to Rome, when Rome no longer had any bulwark to defend her.

It everywhere accepted the challenge; throughout all the conflicts for political and religious liberty, up to the time of the first emigration to America, in France, the Netherlands, England, and Scotland, we recognise the Genevan school. A little bit of the world's history was enacted in Geneva, which forms the proudest portion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A number of the most distinguished men in France, the Netherlands, and Great Britain professed her creed; they are sturdy, gloomy souls, iron characters cast in one mold, in which there was an interfusion of Romanic, Germanic, mediaeval, and modern elements; and the national and political consequences of the new faith were carried out by them with the utmost rigour and consistency.

[We have taken up Calvin thus fully because it was largely upon his teachings that the creeds were based which were held by the French Huguenots, the Protestants of Holland, the Scotch and English Presbyterians, and hence by the Pilgrims and Puritans who came to America.]

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE

The Albigenses

[Long before Calvin and Luther, long before Wyclif of England, there had been free-thinkers in southern France. They had possibly been influenced by creeds from the far East. Some were put to death for heresy as far back as 1022. In 1181 a French chronicler spoke of them as Albigenses. They protested against corruption in the Church. In 1209 Pope Innocent III ordered a crusade against them, and they were finally driven away or exterminated.]

The Waldenses or Vaudois

[Peter Waldo, or Valdez, a rich merchant of Lyons, in 1170 gave his property to the poor and began to preach Christ. His followers were called the "poor men of Lyons." Their simple life and beliefs did not save them from the tortures inflicted upon heretics. Probably the most severe attempt to destroy the sect was made in 1545 by Francis I of France. As Guizot says: "In the end three small towns and twenty-two villages were completely sacked; seven hundred and sixty-three houses, eighty-nine cattle-sheds, and thirty-one barns burned; three thousand persons massacred; two hundred and fifty-five executed subsequently to the massacre, after a mockery of trial; six or seven hundred sent to the galleys; many children sold for slaves; and the victors, on retiring, left behind them a double ordinance, from the Parliament of Aix and the vice-legat of Avignon, dated April 24, 1545, forbidding "that any one, on pain of death, should dare to give asylum, aid or succor, or furnish money or victuals, to any Vaudian or heretic." See *In His Name* by Edward Everett Hale.]

The Huguenots

[During the period of the reformation in France there was enacted one of the greatest tragedies of history. Let us look at the characters in the drama:

Francis I, rival of Emperor Charles V, had died in 1547. Henry II of France, son of Francis I, died in 1559. Henry the Second's sons, Francis II, 1544-1560, Charles IX, 1550-1574, Henry III, 1551-1589, inherited the throne in turn, Francis at the age of fifteen, Charles at nine, and Henry III at twenty-three. Their mother, the Queen Dowager, widow of the late King Henry Second, was Catherine de Medici, great-grand-daughter of Lorenzo de Medici, the Magnificent, of Florence. She, as regent for her sons, was the power behind the throne during their reigns. She is one of the most terrible characters of history.

Other actors in the tragedy were: the Guise family, leaders of the Catholics

against the Huguenots (Protestants), Charles de Guise, (Cardinal of Lorraine), and his brother, the second Duke of Guise.

Admiral Coligny, a famous French general and a leading Huguenot.

Henry of Navarre (Navarre was a small state near the Pyrenees), a Bourbon, and next heir to the French throne after the death of Catherine's sons, who all died childless. He was also a Huguenot. He married on August 18, 1572, Margaret de Valois, daughter of Catherine de Medici.

Henry of Navarre's brother, Prince Louis of Condé, was also a Huguenot.

The Duke of Anjou, (title of each of Henry Second's sons before they became king), in 1572 was Henry, later Henry III, brother of Charles IX.]

The Reformation⁸ went on growing from day to day. In 1558, Lorenzo, the Venetian ambassador, set down even then the number of the reformers at four hundred thousand. In 1559, at the death of Henry II, Claude Haton, a priest and contemporary chronicler on the Catholic side, calculated that they were nearly a quarter of the population of France. Admiral de Coligny's youngest brother, Francis d'Andelot, declared himself a reformer to Henry II himself, who, in his wrath, threw a plate at his head, and sent him to prison in the castle of Melun. Coligny himself, who had never disguised the favorable sentiments he felt towards the reformers, openly sided with them on the ground of his own personal faith, as well as of the justice due to them. At last the Reformation had really great leaders, men who had power and were experienced in the affairs of the world; it was becoming a political party as well as a religious conviction; and the French reformers were henceforth in a condition to make war as well as die at the stake for their faith.

When Francis II, a boy of sixteen, a poor creature both in mind and body, ascended the throne, deputies from Parliament went, according to custom, to offer their felicitations to the new king, and to ask him "to whom it was his pleasure that they should, henceforward, apply for to learn his will and receive his commands." Francis II replied, "With the approbation of the Queen, my mother, I have chosen the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, my uncles, to have direction of the state."

⁸ Quoted from Guizot.

A proclamation of Francis II ordained that houses in which assemblies of reformers took place should be razed and demolished. Another royal act provided that all persons, even relatives, who received amongst them any one condemned for heresy should seize him and bring him to justice, in default whereof they would suffer the same penalty as he. Whilst the Catholic party, by means of the Guises, and with the support of the majority of the country, took in hand the government of France, the reforming party ranged themselves round the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and Admiral de Coligny, and became, under their direction, though in a minority, a powerful opposition.

Charles IX, a child of ten, on announcing to the Parliament the death of his brother Francis II wrote that "confiding in the virtues and prudence of the queen-mother, he had begged her to take in hand the administration of the kingdom, with the wise counsel and advice of the King of Navarre and the notables and great personages of the late king's council."

The queen-mother of France, Catherine de Medici, was, to use the words of the Venetian ambassador John Michieli, who had lived at her court, "a woman of forty-three, of affable manners, great moderation, superior intelligence, and ability in conducting all sorts of affairs, especially affairs of state. As mother, she has the personal management of the king; she allows no one else to sleep in his room; she is never away from him. As regent and head of the government, she holds everything in her hands, public offices, benefices, graces, and the seal which bears the king's signature. In the council, she allows the others to speak; she replies to any one who needs it; she decides according to the advice of the council, or according to what she may have made up her mind to. She opens the letters addressed to the king by his ambassadors and by all his ministers. She has great designs, and does not allow them to be easily penetrated. As for her way of living, she is very fond of her ease and pleasure; she observes few rules; she eats and drinks a great deal; she considers that she makes up for it by taking a great deal of exercise a-foot and a-horseback."

Before we call to mind and estimate as they deserve, the actions of her government, we must give a correct idea of the moral condition of the people governed, of their unbridled passions, and of the share of responsibility reverting to them in the crimes and shocking errors of that period. It is a mistake and an injustice, only too common, to lay all the burden of such facts, and the odium justly due to them, upon the great actors almost exclusively whose name has remained attached to them in history; the people themselves have very often been the prime movers in them; they have very often preceded and urged on their masters in the black deeds which have sullied their history; and on the masses as well as on the leaders ought the just sentence of posterity to fall. The moment we speak of the St. Bartholomew, it seems as if Charles IX, Catherine de Medici, and the Guises issued from their graves to receive that sentence; and God forbid that we should wish to deliver them from it; but it hits the nameless populace of their day as well as themselves, and the hands of the people, far more than the will of kings, began the tale of massacres for religion's sake.

From 1561 to 1572 there were in France eighteen or twenty massacres of Protestants, four or five of Catholics, and thirty or forty single murders sufficiently important to have been kept in remembrance by history; and during that space of time formal civil war, religious and partisan, broke out, stopped and recommenced in four campaigns, signalized, each of them, by great battles, and four times terminated by impotent or deceptive treaties of peace which, on the 24th of August, 1572, ended, for their sole result, in the greatest massacre of French history, the St. Bartholomew.

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1572

There had already, thirteen or fourteen years previously, been some talk of a marriage between Henry of Navarre and Margaret de Valois, even when both of them were mere babies. This union between the two branches of the royal house, one

Catholic and the other Protestant, ought to have been the most striking sign and surest pledge of peace between Catholicism and Protestantism. The political expediency of such a step appeared the more evident and the more urgent in proportion as the religious war had become more direful and the desire for peace more general. Charles IX embraced the idea passionately. . . .

It was near the time fixed for the marriage of Henry of Navarre and Marguerite de Valois. The Queen of Navarre, the mother, who had gone to Paris in preparation for the marriage, had died there on the 8th of June, 1572; a death which had given rise to very likely ill-founded accusations of poisoning. . . . It was in deep mourning that her son, become King of Navarre, arrived at court, attended by eight hundred gentlemen, all likewise in mourning. "But," says Marguerite de Valois herself, "the nuptials took place a few days afterwards with such triumph and magnificence as none others of my quality; the King of Navarre and his troop having changed their mourning for very rich and fine clothes, and I being dressed royally, with crown and corset of tufted ermine, all blazing with crown-jewels, and the grand blue mantle with a train four ells long borne by three princesses, the people choking one another down below to see us pass." The marriage was celebrated on the 18th of August, by the Cardinal of Bourbon, in front of the principal entrance of Notre-Dame. When the Princess Marguerite was asked if she consented, she appeared to hesitate a moment, but King Charles IX put his hand a little roughly on her head, and made her lower it in token of assent. Accompanied by the king, the queen-mother, and all the other Catholics present, Marguerite went to hear mass in the choir; Henry and his Protestant friends walked about the cloister and the nave. . . .

Meanwhile Charles IX was beginning to hesitate. . . . Charles IX, too weak in mind and character to think and act with independence and consistency in the great questions of the day, only sought how to elude them, and to leave time, that inscrutable master, to settle them in his place. His indecision brought him to a state of impotence, and he ended by inability to do anything

but dodge and lie, like his mother, and even with his mother. Whilst he was getting his sister married to the King of Navarre and concerting his policy with Coligny, he was adopting towards the three principal personages who came to talk over those affairs with him three different sorts of language....

His contemporary Catholic biographer, Papirius Masson, who was twenty-eight years old at the time of the St. Bartholomew, says of him, "He is impatient in waiting, ferocious in his fits of anger, skilfully masked when he wishes, and ready to break faith as soon as that appears to his advantage."

Such was the prince, fiery and flighty, inconsistent and artful, accessible to the most opposite sympathies as well as hatreds, of whom Catherine de' Medici and Admiral Coligny were disputing the possession....

The king was hunting at Brie. The queen-mother went and joined him; she shut herself up with him in a cabinet, and, bursting into tears, she said, "I should never have thought that, in return for having taken so much pains to bring you up and preserve to you the crown, you would have had heart to make me so miserable a recompense. You hide yourself from me, me who am your mother, in order to take counsel of your enemies. I know that you hold secret counsels with the admiral; you desire to plunge rashly into war with Spain, in order to give your kingdom, yourself, and the persons that are yours, over as a prey to them of the religion. If I am so miserable a creature, yet before I see that, give me leave to withdraw to the place of my birth; remove from you your brother, who may call himself unfortunate in having employed his own life to preserve yours; give him at least time to withdraw out of danger and from the presence of enemies made in doing you service; Huguenots who desire not war with Spain, but with France, and the subversion of all the Estates in order to set up themselves.... "

Charles IX himself felt some disquietude as to the meeting of the Guises and Coligny at his court. The Guises had quitted it before the 18th of August, the day fixed for the marriage of

King Henry of Navarre with Marguerite de Valois. When the marriage was over, they were to return, and they did. At the moment of their returning, the king said to Coligny, with demonstrations of the most sincere friendship, "You know, my dear father, the promise you made me not to insult any of the Guises as long as you remained at court. On their side, they have given me their word that they will have for you, and all the gentry of your following, the consideration you deserve. I rely entirely upon your word, but I have not so much confidence in theirs; I know that they are only looking for an opportunity of letting their vengeance burst forth; I know their bold and haughty character; as they have the people of Paris devoted to them, and as, on coming hither, under pretext of the rejoicings at my sister's marriage, they have brought a numerous body of well-armed soldiers, I should be inconsolable if they were to take anything in hand against you; such an outrage would recoil upon me. That being so, if you think as I do, I believe the best thing for me is to order into the city the regiment of guards...."

On Friday, the 22d of August, 1572, Coligny was returning on foot from the Louvre to the Rue des Fossés-St. Germain-l'Auxerrois, where he lived; he was occupied in reading a letter which he had just received; a shot, fired from the window of a house in the cloister of St. Germain l'Auxerrois, smashed two fingers of his right hand and lodged a ball in his left arm; he raised his eyes, pointed out with his injured hand the house whence the shot had come, and reached his quarters on foot. Two gentlemen who were in attendance upon him rushed to seize the murderer; it was too late; Maurevert⁹ had been lodging there and on the watch for three days at the house of a canon, an old tutor to the Duke of Guise; a horse from the duke's stable was waiting for him at the back of the house; and, having done his job, he departed at a gallop. He was pursued for several leagues without being overtaken.

⁹ Called the king's slaughter-man.

Coligny sent to apprise the king of what had just happened to him. "There," said he, "was a fine proof of fidelity to the agreement between him and the Duke of Guise." "I shall never have rest, then!" cried Charles, breaking the stick with which he was playing tennis with the Duke of Guise and Téligny, the admiral's son-in-law; and he immediately returned to his room. The Duke of Guise took himself off without a word. Téligny speedily joined his father-in-law. Ambrose Paré had already attended to him, cutting off the two broken fingers; somebody expressed a fear that the balls might have been poisoned. "It will be as God pleases as to that," said Coligny; and, turning towards the minister, Merlin, who had hurried to him, he added, "pray that He may grant me the gift of perseverance."

About two P. M., the king, the queen mother, and the Dukes of Anjou and Alençon, her two other sons, with many of their high officers, repaired to the admiral's. "My dear father," said the king, as he went in, "the hurt is yours; the grief and the outrage mine; but I will take such vengeance that it shall never be forgotten;" to which he added his usual imprecations. "Then the admiral, who lay in bed sorely wounded," says the Duke of Anjou himself, in his account of this interview, "requested that he might speak privately to the king, which the king granted readily, making a sign to the queen my mother, and to me, to withdraw, which we did incontinently into the middle of the room, where we remained standing during this secret colloquy, which caused us great misgiving. We saw ourselves surrounded by more than two hundred gentlemen and captains of the admiral's party, who were in the room and another adjoining, and, besides, in a hall below, the which, with sad faces and the gestures and bearing of malcontents, were whispering in one another's ears, frequently passing and repassing before and behind us, not with so much honor and respect as they ought to have done and as if they had some suspicion that we had somewhat to do with the admiral's hurt. We were seized with astonishment and fear at seeing ourselves shut in there, as my mother has since many times confessed to me,

saying that she had never been in any place where there was so much cause for fright, and whence she had gone away with more relief and pleasure. This apprehension caused us to speedily break in upon the conversation the admiral was having with the king, under a polite excuse invented by the queen my mother, who, approaching the king, said out loud that she had no idea he would make the admiral talk so much, and that she saw quite well that his physicians and surgeons considered it bad for him, as it certainly was very dangerous, and enough to throw him into a fever, which was, above everything, to be guarded against. She begged the king to put off the rest of their conversation to another time, when the admiral was better. This vexed the king mightily, for he was very anxious to hear the remainder of what the admiral had to say to him. However, he being unable to gainsay so specious an argument, we got the king away. And incontinently the queen mother (and I too) begged the king to let us know the secret conversation which the admiral had held with him, and in which he had been unwilling that we should be participators; which the king refused several times to do. But finding himself importuned and hard pressed by us, he told us abruptly and with displeasure, swearing by God's death 'that what the admiral said was true, that kings realized themselves as such in France only in so far as they had the power of doing harm or good to their subjects and servants, and that this power and management of affairs had slipped imperceptibly into the hands of the queen my mother and mine.' 'This superintendent domination, the admiral told me, might some day be very prejudicial to me and to all my kingdom, and that I should hold it in suspicion and beware of it; of which he was anxious to warn me, as one of my best and most faithful subjects, before he died. There, God's death, as you wish to know, is what the admiral said to me.' This, said as it was with passion and fury, went straight home to our hearts, which we concealed as best we might, both of us, however, defending ourselves in the matter. We continued this conversation all the way from the admiral's quarters to the Louvre, where, having left the king in

his room, we retired to that of the queen my mother, who was piqued and hurt to the utmost degree at this language used by the admiral to the king, as well as the credence which the king seemed to accord to it, and was fearful lest it should bring about some change and alteration in our affairs and in the management of the state. Being unable to resolve upon any course at the moment, we retired, putting off the question till the morrow, when I went to see my mother, who was already up. I had a fine racket in my head, and so had she, and for the time there was no decision come to save to have the admiral despatched by some means or other. It being impossible any longer to employ stratagems and artifices, it would have to be done openly, and the king brought round to that way of thinking. We agreed that, in the afternoon, we would go and pay him a visit in his closet, whither we would get the *Sieur de Nevers*, *Marshals de Tavannes and de Retz*, and *Chancellor de Birague* to come, merely to have their opinion as to the means to be adopted for the execution, which we had already determined upon, my mother and I."

On Saturday, the 23d of August, in the afternoon, the queen mother, the *Duke of Anjou*, *Marshals de Tavannes and de Retz*, the *Duke of Nevers*, and the *Chancellor de Birague* met in the king's closet, who was irresolute and still talking of exacting from the *Guises* heavy vengeance for the murderous attack upon *Coligny*. Catherine "represented to him that the party of the *Huguenots* had already seized this occasion for taking up arms against him; they had sent," she said, "several despatches to Germany to procure a levy of ten thousand reiters, and to the cantons of the Swiss for another levy of ten thousand foot; the French captains, partisans of the *Huguenots*, had already, most of them, set out to raise levies within the kingdom: time and place of meeting had already been assigned and determined. All the Catholics, on their side," added Catherine, "disgusted with so long a war and harassed by so many kinds of calamities, have resolved to put a stop to them; they have decided amongst them to elect a captain-general, to form a league offensive and defensive

against the Huguenots. The whole of France would thus be seen armed and divided into two great parties, between which the king would remain isolated, without any command and with about as much obedience. For so much ruin and calamity in anticipation and already within a finger's reach, and for the slaughter of so many thousand of men, a preventive may be found in a single sword-thrust; all that is necessary is to kill the admiral, the head and front of all the civil wars; the designs and the enterprises of the Huguenots will die with him, and the Catholics, satisfied with the sacrifice of two or three men, will remain forever in obedience to the king. . . . At the beginning," continues the Duke of Anjou, in his account, "the king would not by any means consent to have the admiral touched; feeling, however, some fear of the danger which we had so well depicted and represented to him, he desired that, in a case of such importance, every one should at once state his opinion." When each of those present had spoken, the king appeared still undecided. The queen-mother then resolved "to let him hear the truth *in toto* from Marshal de Retz, from whom she knew that he would take it better than from any other," says his sister Marguerite de Valois in her *Mémoires*, "as one who was more in his confidence and favor than any other. The which came to see him in the evening, about nine or ten, and told him that, as his faithful servant, he could not conceal from him the danger he was in if he were to abide by his resolution to do justice on M. de Guise, because it was necessary that he should know that the attack upon the admiral was not M. de Guise's doing alone, but my brother Henry, the King of Poland, afterwards King of France, and the queen my mother, had been concerned in it; which M. de Guise and his friends would not fail to reveal, and which would place his Majesty in a position of great danger and embarrassment." Towards midnight, the queen-mother went down to the king, followed by her son Henry and four other councillors. They found the king more put out than ever. The conversation began again, and resolved itself into a regular attack upon the king. "The Guises," he ^{was} told, "will denounce the king himself,

together with his mother and brother; the Huguenots will believe that the king was in concert with the party, and they will take the whole royal family to task. War is inevitable. Better to win a battle in Paris, where we would hold all the chiefs in our clutches, than put it to hazard in the field." "After a struggle of an hour and a half, Charles, in a violent state of agitation, still hesitated; when the queen-mother, fearing lest, if there were further delay, all would be discovered, said to him, 'Permit me and your brother, sir, to retire to some other part of the kingdom.' Charles rose from his seat. 'By God's death,' said he, 'since you think proper to kill the admiral, I consent; but all the Huguenots in Paris as well, in order that there remain not one to reproach me afterwards. Give the orders at once.'" And he went back into his room. . . .¹⁰

Once let loose upon the St. Bartholomew, the Parisian populace was eager indeed, but not alone in its eagerness, for the work of massacre; the gentlemen of the court took part in it passionately, from a spirit of vengeance, from religious hatred, from the effect of smelling blood, from covetousness at the prospect of confiscations at hand.

We might multiply indefinitely scenes of the massacre, most of them brutally ferocious, others painfully pathetic, some generous and calculated to preserve the credit of humanity amidst one of its most direful aberrations. History must show no pity for the vices and crimes of men, whether princes or people; and it is her duty as well as her right to depict them so truthfully that men's souls and imaginations may be sufficiently impressed by them to conceive disgust and horror at them; but it is not by dwelling upon them and by describing them minutely, as if she had to exhibit a gallery of monsters and madmen, that history can lead men's minds to sound judgments and salutary impressions; it is necessary to have moral sense and good sense always in view, and set high above great social troubles, just as sailors, to struggle courageously against the tempest, need to see a luminous corner

¹⁰ The massacre which had been already planned was immediately begun.

where the sky is visible, and a star which reveals to them the port. We take no pleasure, and we see no use, in setting forth in detail the works of evil; we should be inclined to fear that, by familiarity with such a spectacle, men would lose the perception of good, and cease to put hope in its legitimate and ultimate superiority. The great historic fact of the St Bartholomew is what we confine ourselves to; and we have attempted to depict it accurately as regards Charles IX's hesitations and equally feverish resolutions, his intermixture of open-heartedness and double-dealing in his treatment of Coligny, towards whom he felt himself drawn without quite understanding him, and his puerile weakness in presence of his mother, whom he feared more than he trusted. When he had plunged into the orgies of the massacre, when, after having said, "Kill them all!" he had seen the slaughter of his companions in his royal amusements, T  ligny and La Rochefoucauld, Charles IX abandoned himself to a fit of mad passion. Some days later "he issued his orders," says Sully, "prohibiting on pain of death, any slaying or plundering; the which were, nevertheless, very ill observed, the animosities and fury of the populace being too much inflamed to defer to them."¹¹

The historians, Catholic or Protestant, contemporary or researchful, differ widely as to the number of the victims in this cruel massacre; according to De Thou, there were about two thousand persons killed in Paris the first day; D'Aubign   says three thousand; Brant  me speaks of four thousand bodies that Charles IX might have seen floating down the Seine; La Popelini  re reduces them to one thousand. There is to be found, in the account-books of the city of Paris, a payment to the grave-diggers of the cemetery of the Innocents for having interred eleven hundred dead bodies stranded at the turns of the Seine near Chaillot, Auteuil, and St. Cloud; it is probable that many corpses were carried still farther, and the corpses were not all thrown into the river. The uncertainty is still greater when one comes to speak of the number

¹¹The Duke of Sully in his *Economies Royales*. He was a Huguenot and Minister of Finance from 1597 to 1610 under Henry IV.

of victims throughout the whole of France; De Thou estimates it at thirty thousand, Sully at seventy thousand, Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris in the seventeenth century, raises it to one hundred thousand; Papirius Masson and Davila reduce it to ten thousand, without clearly distinguishing between the massacre of Paris and those of the provinces; other historians fix upon forty thousand....

One thing which is quite true, and which it is good to call to mind in the midst of so great a general criminality, is that, at many spots in France, it met with a refusal to be associated in it; at Dijou, in Provence, at Mâcon, at Rouen, in Dauphiny and elsewhere, chiefs, military or civil, openly repudiated the example set by the murderers of Paris; as did the municipal body of Nantes, a very Catholic town as has been proved from authentic documents.....

[War broke out again in November 1572 between Catholics and Protestants. The city of La Rochelle repulsed the Catholic besiegers led by the Duke of Guise. The peace of La Rochelle signed July 6, 1573, granted liberty of creed and worship to three towns, La Rochelle, Montauban, and Nîmes, and promised that the Huguenots should not be persecuted.

Charles IX died May 30, 1574. His brother Henry III ruled, influenced by his mother, for fifteen years. By his order Henry, Duke of Guise, was assassinated, and then Henry III in turn was murdered.

Henry of Navarre took the throne as Henry IV August 2, 1589. Catherine de Medici had died in January. As Guizot says, Henry IV set his thoughts "upon the general and natural interests of France as he found her and saw her. They resolved themselves, in his eyes, into the following great points: maintainance of the hereditary rights of monarchy, preponderance of Catholics in the government, peace between Catholics and Protestants, and religious liberty for Protestants. With him these points became the law of his policy and his kingly duty, as well as the nation's right. He proclaimed them in the first words that he addressed to the lords and principal personages of state assembled around him. 'I have heard that some who are in my army feel scruples about remaining in my service unless I embrace the Catholic religion. No doubt they think me weak enough for them to imagine that they can force me thereby to abjure my religion and break my word. I am very glad to inform them here, in presence of you all, that I would rather this were the last day of my life than take any step which might cause me to be suspected of having dreamt of renouncing my religion before I have been better instructed by a lawful council, to whose authority I bow in advance.' "

But the Catholics split into two divisions, one, the Spanish League, favoring Philip II of Spain as king in place of Henry IV, (they held Paris and prevented Henry IV from entering the city) and the French League which favored Charles, Cardinal of Bourbon for king in place of Henry IV.]

As the government of Henry IV went on growing in strength and extent, two facts, both of them natural, though antagonistic, were being accomplished in France and in Europe. The moderate Catholics were beginning, not as yet to make approaches towards him, but to see a glimmering possibility of treating with him and obtaining from him such concessions as they considered necessary at the same time that they in their turn made to him such as he might consider sufficient for his party and himself. Not only did many moderate Catholics make advances to him, struck with his sympathetic ability and his valor, and hoping that he would end by becoming a Catholic, but patriotic wrath was kindling in France against Philip II and the Spaniards, those fomenters of civil war in the mere interest of foreign ambition.

Whilst the two Leagues were conspiring persistently, sometimes together and sometimes one against the other, to promote personal ambition and interests, at the same time the national instinct, respect for traditional rights, weariness of civil war, and the good sense which is born of long experience, were bringing France more and more over to the cause and name of Henry IV. Would Henry turn Catholic? That was the question asked everywhere, amongst Protestants with anxiety, but with keen desire, and not without hope, amongst the mass of the population.

Born in the reformed faith and on the steps of the throne, Henry IV was struggling to defend his political rights whilst keeping his religious creed; but his religious creed was not the fruit of very mature or very deep conviction; it was a question of first claims and of honor rather than a matter of conscience; and on the other hand the peace of France, her prosperity, perhaps her territorial integrity, were dependent upon the triumph of the political rights of the Béarnese. Even for his brethren in creed his triumph was a benefit secured, for it was an end of persecution and a first

step towards liberty. There is no measuring accurately how far ambition, personal interest, a king's egotism, had to do with Henry's IV.'s abjuration of his religion; none would deny that those human infirmities were present; but all this does not prevent the conviction that patriotism was uppermost in Henry's soul, and that the idea of his duty as king towards France, a prey to all the evils of civil and foreign war, was the determining motive of his resolution.

When he discussed with the Catholic prelates the conditions of his abjuration, he had those withdrawn which would have been too great a shock to his personal feelings and shackled his conduct too much in the government, as would have been the case with the promise to labor for the destruction of heresy. Even as regarded the Catholic faith, he demanded of the doctors who were preparing him for it some latitude for his own thoughts, and "that he should not have such violence done to his conscience as to be bound to strange oaths, and to sign and believe rubbish which he was quite sure that the majority of them did not believe." The most passionate Protestants of his own time reproached him, and some still reproach him, with having deserted his creed and having repaid with ingratitude his most devoted comrades in arms and brothers in Christ. Perhaps there is some ingratitude also in forgetting that after four years of struggling to obtain the mastery for his religious creed and his political rights simultaneously, Henry IV., convinced that he could not succeed in that, put a stop to religious wars, and founded, to last for eighty-seven years, the free and lawful practice of the Reformed worship in France, by virtue of the Edict of Nantes, 1598.

THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS OR THE RISE OF HOLLAND

[Emperor Charles V had in 1555 abdicated, turning over to his brother, Ferdinand I (who had married the heiress of Bohemia, and had been given the Austrian and German possessions) the title of Emperor.

To his son Philip II he gave Spain, the Netherlands and the Spanish American possessions. Philip decided to crush out heresy from the Netherlands. Charles V had already made such an attempt. Special topics may be given on: Charles the Fifth's punishment of Ghent in 1540; the ceremony of his abdication; (see both Motley and Prescott); Loyola; the Order of the Jesuits, etc.]

Three¹² great rivers—the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Schelde—had deposited their slime for ages among the dunes and sandbanks heaved up by the ocean around their mouths. A delta was thus formed, habitable at last for man. It was by nature a wide morass, in which oozy islands and savage forests were interspersed among lagoons and shallows; a district lying partly below the level of the ocean at its higher tides, subject to constant overflow from the rivers, and to frequent and terrible inundations by the sea. It was a low land, nether land, hollow land, or Holland.

A race engaged for generations in stubborn conflict with the angry elements was unconsciously educating itself for its great struggle with the still more savage despotism of man.

Early Heresy

By the middle of the twelfth century, many Netherlanders became converts to the doctrines of Waldo. From that period until the appearance of Luther, a succession of sects—Waldenses, Albigenses, Lollards, etc.—waged perpetual but unequal warfare with the power and depravity of the Church. Nowhere was the persecution of heretics more relentless than in the Netherlands.

The priests held ever in readiness a deadly weapon of defense: a blasting anathema was thundered against their antagonist, and smote him into submission.¹³

¹² We quote from John Lothrop Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic*.

¹³ The disciples of Him who ordered his followers to bless their persecutors and to love their enemies, invented such Christian formulas as these: "In the name of the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, the blessed Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, and all other saints in heaven, do we curse and cut off from our communion him who has thus rebelled against us. May the curse strike him in his house, barn, bed, field, path, city, castle. May he be cursed in battle, accursed in praying, in speaking, in silence, in eating, in drinking, in sleeping. May he be accursed in his taste, hearing, smell, and all his senses. May the curse blast his eyes, head, and his body, from his crown to the soles of his feet. I conjure you, Devil,

By the end of the thirteenth century, however, the clerical power was already beginning to decline. It was not the corruption of the Church, but its enormous wealth, which engendered the hatred with which it was by many regarded. Temporal princes and haughty barons began to dispute the right of ecclesiastics to enjoy vast estates while refusing the burden of taxation.

With the invention of printing the cause of the Reformation took a colossal stride in advance. A Bible, which before had cost five hundred crowns, now cost but five. The people acquired the power of reading God's Word, or of hearing it read, for themselves.

The sale of absolutions was the source of large fortunes to the priests. The enormous impudence of this traffic almost exceeds belief. Was it unnatural that plain people who loved the ancient Church should rather desire to see her purged of such blasphemous abuses than to hear of St. Peter's dome rising a little nearer to the clouds on these proceeds of commuted crime?

With the beginning of the sixteenth century the great Reformation was actually alive. The name of Erasmus of Rotterdam was already celebrated—the man who, according to Grotius, “so well showed the road to a reasonable reformation.” But if Erasmus showed the road, he certainly did not travel far upon it himself. Perpetual type of the quietist, the moderate man, he censured the errors of the Church with discrimination and gentleness, as if Borgianism had not been too long rampant at Rome, as if men's minds throughout Christendom were not too deeply stirred to be satisfied with mild rebukes against sin, especially when the mild rebuker was in receipt of livings and salaries from the sinner. Instead of rebukes, the age wanted reforms. The sage of Rotterdam was a keen observer, a shrewd satirist, but a moderate moralist. He loved ease, good company, the soft repose of princely

and all your imps, that you take no rest till you have brought him to eternal shame; till he is destroyed by drowning or hanging, till he is torn to pieces by wild beasts, or consumed by fire. Let his children become orphans, his wife a widow. I command you, Devil, and all your imps, that even as I now blow out these torches, you do immediately extinguish the light from his eyes. So be it, Amen, Amen.” So speaking, the curser was wont to blow out two waxen torches which he held in his hands, and with this practical illustration the anathema was complete. (from Motley.)

palaces, better than a life of martyrdom and a death at the stake. He was not of the stuff of which martyrs are made, as he handsomely confessed on more than one occasion. "Let others affect martyrdom," he said; "for myself, I am unworthy of the honor"; and, at another time, "I am not of a mind," he observed, "to venture my life for the truth's sake; all men have not strength to endure the martyr's death. For myself, if it came to the point, I should do no better than Simon Peter." . . . Although awake to the abuses of the Church, he thought Luther going too fast and too far. He began by applauding, ended by censuring, the monk of Wittenberg. The Reformation might have been delayed for centuries had Erasmus and other moderate men been the only reformers.

Sincere Catholics, who loved and honored the ancient religion, shrank with horror at the spectacle offered on every side. Criminals buying paradise for money, monks spending the money thus paid in gaming-houses, taverns, and brothels—this seemed, to those who had studied their Testaments, a different scheme of salvation from the one promulgated by Christ.

In 1535 an imperial edict was issued at Brussels condemning all heretics to death; repentant males to be executed with the sword, repentant females to be buried alive, the obstinate of both sexes to be burned. This and similar edicts were the law of the land for twenty years, and rigidly enforced.

Philip II 1527-1598

Philip II, was a small, meager man, much below the middle height, with thin legs, a narrow chest, and the shrinking, timid, air of an habitual invalid. In face he was the living image of his father, having the same broad forehead and blue eyes, with the same aquiline but better-proportioned nose. In the lower part of the countenance the remarkable Burgundian deformity was likewise reproduced. He had the same heavy, hanging lip, with a vast mouth and monstrously protruding lower jaw. His complexion was fair, his hair light and thin, his beard yellow, short

and pointed. He had the aspect of a Fleming, but the loftiness of a Spaniard. His demeanor in public was still, silent, almost sepulchral. He looked habitually on the ground when he conversed, was chary of speech, embarrassed, and even suffering in manner. This was ascribed partly to a natural haughtiness which he occasionally endeavored to overcome, and partly to habitual pains in the stomach, occasioned by his inordinate fondness for pastry.

Such was the personal appearance of the man who was about to receive into his single hand the destinies of half the world.¹⁴

The early part of the year 1559 was spent by Philip in organizing the government of the provinces. August 7, 1559 all the provinces were convoked at Ghent to receive the parting communication and farewell of the king. Previously to this day, however, Philip appeared in person upon several occasions, to impress upon the country the necessity of attending to the great subject with which his mind was exclusively occupied. He came before the Great Council of Mechlin, in order to address that body with his own lips upon the necessity of supporting the edicts to the letter, and of trampling out every vestige of heresy, wherever it should appear, by the immediate immolation of all heretics, whoever they might be.

Early in January the king had written to the pope for authority to increase, if that were possible, the stringency of the Spanish Inquisition.

The edicts had been endured, but not accepted. The horrible persecution under which so many thousands had sunk had produced its inevitable result. Fertilized by all this innocent blood, the soil of the Netherlands became as a watered garden, in which liberty, civil and religious, was to flourish perennially. The scaffold had its daily victims, but did not make a single convert. The

¹⁴ Philip had married first his cousin Maria of Portugal who died in 1544. In 1554 he married Mary Tudor, eldest daughter of Henry VIII of England. She died in 1558. He sought to marry Queen Elizabeth but on her persistent refusal, married Elizabeth, daughter of Henry II of France and after her death in 1569, Anne, daughter of Maximilian II.]

statistics of these crimes will never perhaps be accurately adjusted, nor will it be ascertained whether the famous estimate of Grotius was an exaggerated or an inadequate calculation. Those who love horrible details may find ample material. The chronicles contain the lists of these obscure martyrs. For them all was terrible reality. The edicts, the axe, the stake, were realities, and the heroism with which men took each other by the hand and walked into the flames, or with which women sang a song of triumph while the grave digger was shovelling the earth upon their living faces, was a reality also.

The Spanish Inquisition

The Spanish Inquisition, the institution established by Pope Alexander VI and Ferdinand, the Fifth, King of Naples, the Catholic, was doubtless invested with a more complete apparatus for inflicting human misery and for appalling human imagination than any of the other less artfully arranged inquisitions, whether papal or episcopal. It had been originally devised for Jews or Moors, whom the Christianity of the age did not regard as human beings, but who could not be banished without depopulating certain districts. It was soon, however, extended from pagans to heretics. The Dominican Torquemada was the first Moloch to be placed upon this pedestal of blood and fire, and from that day forward the "Holy Office" was almost exclusively in the hands of that band of brothers. In the eighteen years of Torquemada's administration, ten thousand two hundred and twenty individuals were burned alive, and ninety-seven thousand three hundred and twenty-one punished with infamy, confiscation of property, or perpetual imprisonment, so that the total number of families destroyed by this one friar alone amounted to one hundred and fourteen thousand four hundred and one. In course of time the jurisdiction of the office was extended. It taught the savages of India and America to shudder at the name of Christianity. The fear of its introduction froze the earlier heretics of Italy, France, and Germany into orthodoxy. It was a court owning allegiance

to no temporal authority, superior to all other tribunals. It was a bench of monks without appeal, having its familiars in every house, diving into the secrets of every fireside, judging and executing its horrible decrees without responsibility. It condemned not deeds, but thoughts. It affected to descend into individual conscience, and to punish the crimes which it pretended to discover. Its process was reduced to a horrible simplicity. It arrested on suspicion, tortured till confession, and then punished by fire. Two witnesses, and those to separate facts, were sufficient to consign the victim to a loathsome dungeon. Here he was sparingly supplied with food, forbidden to speak, or even to sing,—to which pastime it could hardly be thought he would feel much inclination,—and then left to himself till famine and misery should break his spirit. When that time was supposed to have arrived he was examined. Did he confess and forswear his heresy, whether actually innocent or not, he might then assume the sacred shirt, and escape with confiscation of all his property. Did he persist in the avowal of his innocence, two witnesses sent him to the stake, one witness to the rack. He was informed of the testimony against him, but never confronted with the witness. That accuser might be his son, father, or his wife; for all were enjoined, under the death-penalty, to inform the inquisitors of every suspicious word which might fall from their nearest relatives. The indictment being thus supported, the prisoner was tried by torture. The rack was the court of justice; the criminal's only advocate was his fortitude—for the nominal counselor, who was permitted no communication with the prisoner and was furnished neither with documents nor with power to procure evidence, was a puppet, aggravating the lawlessness of the proceedings by the mockery of legal forms. The torture took place at midnight, in a gloomy dungeon, dimly lighted by torches. The victim—whether man, matron, or maid was stripped naked, and stretched upon the wooden bench. Water, weights, fires, pulleys, screws—all the apparatus by which the sinews could be strained without cracking, the bones crushed without breaking, and the body racked exquisitely without giving up its

ghost, was now put into operation. The executioner, enveloped in a black robe from head to foot, with his eyes glaring at his victim through holes cut in the hood which muffled his face, practised successively all the forms of torture which the devilish ingenuity of the monks had invented. The imagination sickens when striving to keep pace with these dreadful realities. Those who wish to indulge their curiosity concerning the details of the system may easily satisfy themselves at the present day. The flood of light which has been poured upon the subject more than justifies the horror and the rebellion of the Netherlanders.

The period during which torture might be inflicted from day to day was unlimited in duration. It could only be terminated by confession, so that the scaffold was the sole refuge from the rack. Individuals have borne the torture and the dungeon fifteen years, and have been burned at the stake at last.

Execution followed confession, but the number of condemned prisoners was allowed to accumulate, that a multitude of victims might grace each gala-day. The auto da fe was a solemn festival. The monarch, the high functionaries of the land, the reverend clergy, the populace, regarded it as an inspiring and delightful recreation. When the appointed morning arrived, the victim was taken from his dungeon. He was then attired in a yellow robe without sleeves, like a herald's coat, embroidered all over with black figures of devils. A large conical paper miter was placed upon his head, upon which was represented a human being in the midst of flames, surrounded by imps. His tongue was then painfully gagged, so that he could neither open nor shut his mouth. After he was thus accoutred, and just as he was leaving his cell, a breakfast, consisting of every delicacy was placed before him, and he was urged, with ironical politeness, to satisfy his hunger. He was then led forth into the public square. The procession was formed with great pomp. It was headed by the little school-children, who were immediately followed by the band of prisoners, each attired in the horrible yet ludicrous manner described. Then came the magistrates and nobility, the prelates and other dignitaries of the

Church. The holy inquisitors, with their officials and familiars, followed, all on horseback, with the blood-red flag of the "Sacred Office" waving above them, blazoned upon either side with the portraits of Alexander and of Ferdinand, the pair of brothers who had established the institution. After the procession came the rabble. When all had reached the neighborhood of the scaffold, and had been arranged in order, a sermon was preached to the assembled multitude. It was filled with laudations of the Inquisition, and with blasphemous revilings against the condemned prisoners. Then the sentences were read to the individual victims. Then the clergy chanted the Fifty-first Psalm, the whole vast throng uniting in one tremendous *miserere*. If a priest happened to be among the culprits, he was now stripped of the canonicals which he had hitherto worn, while his hands, lips, and shaven crown were scraped with a bit of glass, by which process the oil of his consecration was supposed to be removed. He was then thrown into the common herd. Those of the prisoners who were reconciled, and those whose execution was not yet appointed, were now separated from the others. The rest were compelled to mount a scaffold, where the executioner stood ready to conduct them to the fire. The inquisitors then delivered them into his hands, with an ironical request that he would deal with them tenderly, and without blood-letting or injury. Those who remained steadfast to the last were then burned at the stake; they who in the last extremity renounced their faith were strangled before being thrown into the flames. Such was the *Spanish* Inquisition, technically so called. It was, according to the biographer of Philip II, a "heavenly remedy, a guardian angel of paradise, a lions' den in which Daniel and other just men could sustain no injury, but in which perverse sinners were torn to pieces." It was a tribunal superior to all human law, without appeal, and certainly owing no allegiance to the powers of earth or heaven. No rank, high or humble, was safe from its jurisdiction. The royal family were not sacred, nor the pauper's hovel.

Certainly with this work going on year after year in every

city in the Netherlands, and now set into renewed and vigorous action by a man who wore a crown only that he might better torture his fellow-creatures, it was time that the very stones in the streets should be moved to mutiny.

William the Silent, Prince of Orange

Foremost in resistance was the Prince of Orange.¹⁵ Although a Catholic, he had no relish for the horrible persecutions. For this reason he omitted no remonstrance on the subject to the regent, the Duchess of Parma [half sister to Philip II] to Cardinal Granvelle, and by direct letters to the king. His efforts were seconded by Egmont, Berghen, and other influential nobles.

On Granvelle's head was poured a daily increasing torrent of hatred. He was looked upon in the provinces as the impersonation of that religious oppression which became every moment more intolerable. The king and the regent escaped much of the odium which belonged to them, because the people chose to bestow all their maledictions upon the Cardinal. There was, however, no great injustice in this embodiment. Granvelle was the government. As the people of that day were extremely reverent to royalty, they vented all their rage upon the minister, while maintaining still a conventional respect for the sovereign.

The Prince of Orange was resolved that the cardinal should fall or that he would himself withdraw from all participation in the affairs of government. In this decision he was sustained by Egmont, Horn, Montigny, Berghen, and other leading nobles.

On the 11th of March 1563, Orange, Horn, and Egmont united in a remarkable letter to the king. They said as their longer "taciturnity" might cause the ruin of his Majesty's affairs, they were at last compelled to break silence. They hoped that the king would receive with benignity a communication which was pure, frank, and free from all passion. The leading personages of the province, they continued, having thoroughly examined the

¹⁵ Orange was a small state in southern France. The Prince of Orange was also Count of Nassau, a state in Germany, now included in Prussia.

nature and extent of Cardinal Granvelle's authority, had arrived at the conclusion that everything was in his hands. The royal affairs, it was affirmed, would never be successfully conducted as long as they were intrusted to Granvelle, because he was so odious to so many people.¹⁶

In August, 1564, Philip wrote to the Duchess regent that the decrees were to be proclaimed and enforced without delay. General police regulations were issued at the same time by which heretics were to be excluded from all share in the usual conveniences of society, and were in fact to be strictly excommunicated. Inns were to receive no guests, schools no children, almshouses no paupers, graveyards no dead bodies, unless guests, children, paupers, and dead bodies were furnished with the most satisfactory proofs of orthodoxy. Births, deaths, and marriages could only occur with validity under the shadow of the Church. No human being could consider himself born or defunct unless provided with a priest's certificate. The heretic was excluded, so far as ecclesiastical dogma could exclude him, from the pale of humanity, from consecrated earth and from eternal salvation.

In the dilemma to which the duchess was reduced, she be-thought herself of sending a special mission to Spain. At the end of the year (1564) it was determined that Egmont should be the envoy. There was a stormy debate in the council after Egmont had accepted the mission and immediately before his departure. William the Silent opened his lips, and poured forth a long and vehement discourse, such as he rarely pronounced, but such as few except himself could utter. There was no shuffling, no disguise, no timidity in his language. He took his ground boldly that the time had arrived for speaking out. The object of sending an envoy of high rank and European reputation like the Count of Egmont was to tell the king the truth. Let Philip be informed that this whole machinery of placards and scaffolds, of new bishops and old hangmen, of decrees, inquisitors, and informers must once and

¹⁶ Cardinal Granvelle was finally withdrawn from the Netherlands, but his influence over Philip was still important.

forever be abolished. Their day was over. The Netherlands were free provinces, they were surrounded by free countries, they were determined to vindicate their ancient privileges. Moreover, his Majesty was to be plainly informed of the frightful corruption which made the whole judicial and administrative system loathsome.

The uneasiness, the terror, the wrath of the people seemed rapidly culminating to a crisis. Nothing was talked of but the edicts of the Inquisition.

In the course of the summer [1565] Margaret²⁷ wrote to her brother that the popular frenzy was becoming more and more intense. The people were crying aloud, she said, that the Spanish Inquisition, or a worse, had been established among them by means of bishops and ecclesiastics.

But in November the Inquisition was again formally proclaimed. The cry of a people in its agony ascended to Heaven. The decree was answered with a howl of execration. There was almost a cessation of the ordinary business. Commerce was paralyzed. Antwerp shook as with an earthquake. The foreign merchants, manufacturers, and artisans fled from her gates as if the plague were raging within them. Thriving cities were likely soon to be depopulated. The metropolitan heart of the whole country was almost motionless.

The most remarkable occurrence in the earlier part of the year 1566 was the famous Compromise, a document by which the signers pledged themselves to oppose the Inquisition and to defend each other against all consequences of such a resistance. The Compromise was in its origin a covenant of nobles. It was directed against the foreign influence by which the Netherlands were exclusively governed, and against the Inquisition.

To the eyes of all who loved their fatherland and their race,

[Egmont went to Spain, was greatly fêted there by Philip, who made him great promises, which however were never kept. Egmont and Horn were arrested September 9, 1567 and both were beheaded June 2, 1568. See Goethe's drama, *Egmont*.. Special topics may be given on the Antwerp revolts of 1566 and 1567.]

²⁷ Duchess of Parma.

the sight of a desolate country, with its ancient charters superseded by brute force, its industrious population swarming from the land in droves, as if the pestilence were raging, with gibbets and scaffolds erected in every village, and with a sickening and universal apprehension of still darker disasters to follow, was a spectacle still more sad, hideous, and abominable.

For it was now decided that the Duke of Alva, at the head of the Spanish army, should forthwith take his departure for the Netherlands. A land already subjugated was to be crushed, and every vestige of its ancient liberties destroyed. The conquered provinces, once the abode of municipal liberty, of science, art, and literature, and blessed with an unexampled mercantile and manufacturing prosperity, were to be placed in absolute subjection to the cabinet council at Madrid. A dull and malignant bigot, assisted by a few Spanish grandees, and residing at the other extremity of Europe, was thenceforth to exercise despotic authority over countries which for centuries had enjoyed a local administration and a system nearly approaching to complete self-government. Such was the policy devised by Granvelle and Spinosa, which the Duke of Alva, upon the 15th April, 1567 had left Madrid to enforce.

On the other hand, the work of Orange for the time was finished. He had saved Antwerp, he had done his best to maintain the liberties of the country, the rights of conscience, and the royal authority, so far as they were compatible with each other. The alternative had now been distinctly forced upon every man either to promise blind obedience or to accept the position of a rebel. William of Orange had thus become a rebel. . . . Upon the 22d of April [1567] he took his departure for Dillenburg, the ancestral seat of his family in Germany.

He did not move too soon. Not long after his arrival in Germany, Vandenesse, Philip's private secretary, but Orange's secret agent, wrote him word that he had read letters from the king to Alva, in which the duke was instructed to, "arrest the prince as soon as he could lay hands upon him, and not to let *his trial last more than twenty-four hours.*"

With the departure of Orange a total eclipse seemed to come over the Netherlands. The country was absolutely helpless, the popular heart cold with apprehension. All persons at all implicated in the late troubles, or suspected of heresy, fled from their homes. Fugitive soldiers were hunted into rivers, cut to pieces in the fields, hanged, or drowned like dogs, without quarter, and without remorse. The most industrious and valuable part of the population left the land in droves. The tide swept outward with such rapidity that the Netherlands seemed fast becoming the desolate waste which they had been before the Christian era. Throughout the country those reformers who were unable to effect their escape betook themselves to their old lurking-places. The new religion was banished from all the cities, every conventicle was broken up by armed men, the preachers and leading members were hanged, their disciples beaten with rods, reduced to beggary, or imprisoned, even if they sometimes escaped the scaffold. An incredible number, however, were executed for religious causes. Hardly a village so small, says the Antwerp chronicler, but that it could furnish one, two, or three hundred victims to the executioner. The new churches were leveled to the ground, and out of their timbers gallowses were constructed. It was thought an ingenious pleasantry to hang the reformers upon the beams under which they had hoped to worship God. The property of the fugitives was confiscated. The beggars in name became beggars in reality.

The regent issued a fresh edict upon the 24th May, to refresh the memories of those who might have forgotten previous statutes, which were, however, not calculated to make men oblivious. By this new proclamation all ministers and teachers were sentenced to the gallows. All persons who had suffered their houses to be used for religious purposes were sentenced to the gallows. All parents or masters whose children or servants had attended such meetings were sentenced to the gallows, while the children and servants were only to be beaten with rods. All people who sang hymns at the burial of their relations were sentenced to the gallows. Parents who allowed their newly born children to

be baptized by other hands than those of the Catholic priest were sentenced to the gallows. The same punishment was denounced against the persons who should christen the child or act as its sponsors. Schoolmasters who should teach any error or false doctrine were likewise to be punished with death. Those who infringed the statutes against the buying and selling of religious books and songs were to receive the same doom after the first offense. All sneers or insults against priests and ecclesiastics were also made capital crimes. Vagabonds, fugitives, apostates, runaway monks, were ordered forthwith to depart from every city on pain of death. In all cases confiscation of the whole property of the criminal was added to the hanging.

Yet will it be credited that the edict of 24th May, the provisions of which have just been sketched, actually excited the wrath of Philip on *account of its clemency*? He wrote to the duchess, expressing the pain and dissatisfaction which he felt that an edict so indecent, so illegal, so contrary to the Christian religion, should have been published. Nothing, he said, could offend or distress him more deeply than any outrage whatever, even the slightest one, offered to God and to his Roman Catholic Church. He therefore commanded his sister instantly to revoke the edict. One might almost imagine from the reading of the king's letter that Philip was at last appalled at the horrors committed in his name. Alas! he was only indignant that heretics had been suffered to hang who ought to have been burned, and that a few narrow and almost impossible loopholes had been left through which those who had offended might effect their escape.

And thus, while the country is paralyzed with present and expected woe, the swiftly advancing trumpets of the Spanish army resound from beyond the Alps. The curtain is falling upon the prelude to the great tragedy which the prophetic lips of Orange had foretold. When it is again lifted, scenes of disaster and of bloodshed, battles, sieges, executions, deeds of unfaltering but valiant tyranny, of superhuman and successful resistance, of heroic self-sacrifice, fanatical courage and insane cruelty, both in

the cause of the wrong and the right, will be revealed in awful succession—a spectacle of human energy, human suffering, and human strength to suffer, such as has not often been displayed upon the stage of the world's events.

It was determined at last that the Netherland heresy should be conquered by force of arms. . . . About ten thousand picked and veteran soldiers were thus obtained, of which the Duke of Alva was appointed general-in-chief.

Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, was now in his sixtieth year. He was the most successful and experienced general of Spain or of Europe. . . . As a statesman he had neither experience nor talent. As a man his character was simple. He did not combine a great variety of vices, but those which he had were colossal, and he possessed no virtues. He was neither lustful nor intemperate, but his professed eulogists admitted his enormous avarice, while the world has agreed that such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness and universal bloodthirstiness, was never found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human bosom.

In person he was tall, thin, erect, with a small head, a long visage, lean yellow cheeks, dark twinkling eyes, a dust complexion, black bristling hair, and a long sable-silvered beard, descending in two waving streams upon his breast.

The day of doom for all the crimes which had ever been committed in the course of ages seemed now to have dawned upon the Netherlands. The sword which had so long been hanging over them seemed now about to descend. Throughout the provinces there was but one feeling of cold and hopeless dismay. Those who still saw a possibility of effecting their escape from the fated land swarmed across the frontier. All foreign merchants deserted the great marts. The cities became as still as if the plague-banner had been unfurled on every housetop.

Meantime the captain-general proceeded methodically with his work. He distributed his troops through Brussels, Ghent, Antwerp, and other principal cities. As a measure of necessity

and mark of the last humiliation, he required the municipalities to transfer their keys to his keeping.

In the same despatch of the 9th September [1567] in which the duke communicated to Philip the capture of Egmont and Horn, he announced to him his determination to establish a new court for the trial of crimes committed during the recent period of troubles. This wonderful tribunal was accordingly created with the least possible delay. It was called the Council of Troubles, but it soon acquired the terrible name, by which it will be forever known in history, of the Blood-Council. It superseded all other institutions. Every court, from those of the municipal magistracies up to the supreme councils of the provinces, was forbidden to take cognizance in future of any cause growing out of the late troubles. The council of state, although it was not formally disbanded, fell into complete desuetude, its members being occasionally summoned into Alva's private chambers in an irregular manner, while its principal functions were usurped by the Blood-Council. Not only citizens of every province, but the municipal bodies and even the sovereign estates themselves, were compelled to plead, like humble individuals, before this new and extraordinary tribunal.

The Council of Blood, thus constituted, held its first session on the 20th September, at the lodgings of Alva. Springing completely grown and armed to the teeth from the head of its inventor, the new tribunal—at the very outset in possession of all its vigor—forthwith began to manifest a terrible activity in accomplishing the objects of its existence. The councillors having been sworn to “eternal secrecy as to anything which should be transacted at the board, and having likewise made oath to denounce any one of their number who should violate the pledge,” the court was considered as organized.

Events now marched with rapidity. The monarch seemed disposed literally to execute the threat of his viceroy. Early in the year the most sublime sentence of death was promulgated which has ever been pronounced since the creation of the world. Upon

the 18th February, 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned *all the inhabitants* of the Netherlands *to death* as heretics. From this universal doom *only a few persons, especially named*, were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This is probably the most concise death-warrant that was ever framed. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines.

The Prince of Orange at last threw down the gauntlet. Proscribed, outlawed, with his Netherland property confiscated and his eldest child kidnapped, he saw sufficient personal justification for at last stepping into the lists, the avowed champion of a nation's wrongs. He now made the greatest possible exertions to raise funds and troops. He had many meetings with influential individuals in Germany. The Protestant princes, particularly the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony, promised him assistance. He brought all his powers of eloquence and of diplomacy to make friends for the cause which he had now boldly espoused. The high-born Demosthenes electrified large assemblies by his indignant invectives against the Spanish Philip. He excelled even his royal antagonist in the industrious subtlety with which he began to form a thousand combinations. Swift, secret, incapable of fatigue, this powerful and patient intellect sped to and fro, disentangling the perplexed skein where all had seemed so hopelessly confused, and gradually unfolding broad schemes of a symmetrical and regenerated polity. He had high correspondents and higher hopes in England. He was already secretly or openly in league with half the sovereigns of Germany. The Huguenots of France looked upon him as their friend, and on Louis of Nassau as their inevitable chieftain, were Coligny destined to fall. He was in league with all the exiled and outlawed nobles of the Netherlands. By his orders recruits were daily enlisted, without sound of drum.

Two hundred thousand crowns was the sum which the prince

considered absolutely necessary for organizing the army with which he contemplated making an entrance into the Netherlands. Half this amount had been produced by the cities of Antwerp, Amsterdam, Leyden, Haarlem, Middelburg, Flushing, and other towns, as well as by refugee merchants in England. The other half was subscribed by individuals. The prince himself sold all his jewels, plate, tapestry, and other furniture, which were of almost regal magnificence. Not an enthusiast, but a deliberate, cautious man, he now staked his all upon the hazard, seemingly so desperate.

It was about this time that a deep change came over his mind. Hitherto, although nominally attached to the communion of the ancient Church, his course of life and habits of mind had not led him to deal very earnestly with things beyond the world. The severe duties, the grave character of the cause to which his days were henceforth to be devoted, had already led him to a closer inspection of the essential attributes of Christianity. He was now enrolled for life as a soldier of the Reformation. The Reformation was henceforth his fatherland, the sphere of his duty and his affection. The religious reformers became his brethren, whether in France, Germany, the Netherlands, or England. Yet his mind had taken a higher flight than that of the most eminent reformers. His goal was not a new doctrine, but religious liberty. In an age when to think was a crime, and when bigotry and a persecuting spirit characterized Romanists and Lutherans, Calvinists and Zwinglians, he had dared to announce freedom of conscience as the great object for which noble natures should strive. In an age when toleration was a vice, he had the manhood to cultivate it as a virtue.

And thus did the sovereign of an insignificant little principality stand boldly forth to do battle with the most powerful monarch in the world. At his own expense, and by almost superhuman exertions, he had assembled nearly thirty thousand men. He now boldly proclaimed to the world, especially to the inhabitants of the provinces, his motives, his purposes, and his hopes. (See his declaration of August 31, 1568.)

[We cannot go into detail regarding the long struggle which followed. This war for liberty in the Netherlands, which came two hundred years before the American Revolution, is full of heroic endurance. The massacre of the Huguenots in France, on whose help the Netherlanders had counted, was a cruel blow. How the brave Hollanders summoned the ocean to their assistance by breaking their dykes, the siege of Haarlem, 1572-1573, the siege of Leyden, 1574, "the Spanish Fury" which sacked Antwerp, 1576, may be given in special topics. Motley's dramatic and thrilling account should be read by all if possible.]

In 1576 the provinces of Holland and Zealand and the other fifteen provinces, of the Netherlands formed a union known as the Pacification of Ghent. Later however, the northern and southern provinces separated. But in 1579 the seven northern provinces united under the Treaty of Utrecht, with the Prince of Orange at their head. This was the beginning of what later became the Dutch Republic, or, as we say, Holland. Orange was assassinated by Philip's open orders July 10, 1584. The war continued, and it was not until the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, that Spain finally relinquished her claim to the United Netherlands.]

THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618-1648)¹⁸

Germany, of all the nations of the Continent, had passed through, most thoroughly, from its very beginning, that great mental, moral, vital process which we call the Reformation.

The religious Peace of 1555 had at length given German Lutheranism a legal existence, but it had not created a lasting peace; indeed, it gave rise to almost as many new feuds as it healed old ones. . . . The empire was more than ever destitute of a uniting centre, which was all the more unfortunate because, though it could not be said that things were much changed in Germany, they were all the more changed abroad. . . . If up to the time of the Reformation Germany had been surrounded by weak nations, now several powerful States were on her frontiers. A strong monarchical power had risen in the Scandinavian States; the same had begun to arise in France under Francis I., and, after thirty years of confusion, was completed under Henry IV. On the north and west the situation of Germany was different from what it had been for centuries. No one had before imagined that Denmark or

¹⁸ We quote from Haussier's *The Period of the Reformation*.

Sweden could be dangerous to the German countries on the Baltic, or that France might possess herself of the western provinces. But all these dangers were now at hand, and the neighbours' temptation was great in proportion as Germany's power of resistance was small. . . . The Peace of 1555 was incomplete. It contained dubious and obscure clauses enough; and had there been fewer, that peaceable, conciliatory spirit was wanting on both sides without which no union could be effectual. The Peace granted toleration to the adherents of the Augsburg Confession only, not to the other Reformers; and yet the number of them was considerable. It gave rulers, but not subjects, a claim to toleration, which was the occasion of great difficulties.

During the time when both parties should have been accommodating themselves to this imperfect Peace, occurred the restoration of the Catholic Church, the Council of Trent, the establishment of the order of Jesuits, the restoration of the Inquisition, and the censorship of the press. The idea of toleration, of the peaceful existence of differing creeds side by side, was essentially foreign to the age; the Catholics were too much engrossed with the idea of the supremacy of their Church, the adherents of the new doctrines too much possessed with that zeal for conversion which belongs to young creeds, for any opinion to gain ground that it was better to have an imperfect peace than open war.

[Austria and Bohemia, meantime, had become quite largely Protestant. May 4, 1608 some Protestant princes formed a *Union*. In turn, a Catholic *League* was formed, July 10, 1609.]

The Bohemians now extorted from the weak Emperor Rudolph II the most liberal religious edict issued in the seventeenth century. This was the Bohemian Royal Charter of July 11, 1609.

Ferdinand of Styria, regent for Emperor Mathias of Austria, who was insane, began his government in Bohemia with a crying infringement of the Charter, by closing some churches, and destroying others. In May, 1618, the insurrection broke out at Prague. The hated imperial ministers, Martinitz and Slavata,

were thrown out a window, "according to good old Bohemian custom," as was said by one of the nobles present; a sort of provisional government was established, and an army taken into pay.

The broad views of a ruler who is above all parties, and gives every one his due in his own sphere, were in those days the privilege of a few superior men, like William of Orange and Henry IV. Ferdinand was utterly destitute of them, and his education had taught him to look upon all toleration of this sort as an attack upon religion.

On the death of Mathias, March 20, 1619, Ferdinand was indisputably the next heir to the throne of Austria. Now there was a great question to solve on which depended the immediate future of the house of Hapsburg—the election of Emperor. The imperial dignity brought neither an army nor a treasury. If therefore, Ferdinand reckoned upon defeating the rebels in Prague and Vienna with the power of the German imperial crown, he was mistaken. His election was disputed from the first, for the Bohemians no longer acknowledged him. The Protestants were divided within and without; they abhorred the idea of a Jesuit Emperor, but had only empty ranks and impracticable proposals to oppose to him. After six months of angry negotiation and correspondence, they had not even agreed in the Protestant camp upon a protest against Ferdinand as a candidate; so that when the day of election came, his victory was certain.

The choice of the Bohemians for king fell upon the head of the Union, the Elector Palatine Frederic V,¹⁹ because, so it was stated, "he is a very discreet gentleman, possessing great qualities, and is acquainted with divers languages," because "he has a powerful and well-trained people, and is in alliance with great foreign powers, England, Holland, and Switzerland."

Ferdinand had not the power to subject Bohemia by force of arms. He was therefore compelled to throw himself into the arms of the League. The League now became, and remained for several years, the leading power in Germany.

¹⁹ He was called the "Winter-King of Bohemia." He was a Protestant, but a weak character. His wife was a daughter of James V of Scotland.

On the 8th of October, 1619, Ferdinand concluded a treaty with his relative and the friend of his youth, Max of Bavaria. It provided that Duke Maximilian should undertake the unconditional and exclusive command of the whole proceedings against the rebellious heretics in Austria, Bohemia, and Upper Austria.

In June, 1621, a fearful reign of terror began in Bohemia, with the execution of twenty-seven of the most distinguished heretics. For years the unhappy people bled under it; thousands were banished, and yet Protestantism was not fully exterminated. The charter was cut into shreds by the Emperor himself; there could be no forbearance towards "such acknowledged rebels." As a matter of course, the Lutheran preaching was forbidden under the heaviest penalties; heretical works, Bibles especially, were taken away in heaps. Jesuit colleges, churches, and schools came into power; but this was not all.

A large number of distinguished Protestant families were deprived of their property, and, as if that were not enough, it was decreed that no non-Catholic could be a citizen, nor carry on a trade, enter into marriage, nor make a will; any one who harboured a Protestant preacher forfeited his property; whoever permitted Protestant instruction to be given was to be fined, and whipped out of the town; the Protestant poor who were not converted were to be driven out of the hospitals, and to be replaced by Catholic poor; he who gave free expression to his opinions about religion was to be executed. In 1624 an order was issued to all preachers and teachers to leave the country within eight days, under pain of death; and finally it was ordained that whoever had not become Catholic by Easter, 1626, must emigrate.

But the real conversions were few; thousands quietly remained true to their faith; other thousands wandered as beggars into foreign lands; more than thirty thousand Bohemian families, and among them five hundred belonging to the aristocracy, went into banishment. Exiled Bohemians were to be found in every country of Europe, and were not wanting in any of the armies that fought against Austria.

But a desert was created; the land was crushed for a generation. Before the war Bohemia had 4,000,000 inhabitants, and in 1648 there were but 700,000 or 800,000.

Christian IV of Denmark

As a prince of the German Empire, enjoying great influence in North Germany, Christian IV could not look with apathy at the war in Germany. So he accepted the offer of England and Holland, and began the war in North Germany.

Wallenstein

About this time Emperor Ferdinand II. succeeded in detaching himself from the guardianship of the League, and in carrying on the war with his own resources. The formation and triumphs of this new army are connected with Albrecht von Wallenstein.

Wallenstein belonged to the nobility, but not to the high Bohemian aristocracy. His parents and grandparents, and his family, with few exceptions, were Protestants, but by a singular dispensation, the young Albrecht, born 15th September, 1583, and early left an orphan, was adopted by an uncle, one of the few of the family who had remained faithful to Catholicism, and he brought him back to the old faith. He grew up as a pupil of the Jesuits. A Catholic nobleman was a rarity in Bohemia. He was introduced by his uncle into the service of the Hapsburgs, and early distinguished himself. . . . A talented young soldier, who was at once a Catholic and an adherent of the house of Hapsburg, was a real treasure in those days of general defection. When the revolt broke out in Bohemia, and all his relations were on the Protestant side, he distinguished himself by his strongly marked imperialism.

Wallenstein had early rendered himself independent by a rich marriage. He shunned no sacrifice to secure the favour of the Hapsburgs at the time of their great difficulties, and he had the knack of keeping up an appearance of great expenditure, while he was a good manager; he never lost a favourable opportunity, and

even when he gave liberally was only casting the net for greater gain.

As nearly all the aristocracy were upon the rebel side in the Bohemian revolution, his faithfulness was doubly valuable, and, when the great confiscation of property took place, the time came for him to reap his harvest.

By the year 1622, Ferdinand had confiscated no less than 642 lordships and estates of Bohemian noblemen; and, as he was in great want of money, the spoil was sold at ridiculous prices. The market was flooded with estates; he who had ready money to spend could quickly acquire immense wealth. Wallenstein was a millionaire, and spent seven and one-third millions of florins in buying some of these estates, mostly at absurd prices; and, in addition to the sixty properties thus acquired, he received from the Emperor, for the advances made in his service, the important territory of Friedland . . . for 150,000 florins.

Besides having this good fortune, Wallenstein . . . had great skill in organizing, exercising, disciplining, and providing for an army.

The military system of Europe was then in a transition state from old forms to new, or rather the old forms had disappeared and the new ones had not been discovered. The last relics of feudal service had vanished, and the modern system of a levy of the inhabitants for a standing army had not become general; the armies were neither the one thing nor the other; the men were neither bound to their leaders as faithful vassals, nor bound together as belonging to the same nation. War was a trade in which motives of gain were the only inducement; . . . a moral bond of common sentiments and higher duties was unknown. The troops were hired from all countries. Wherever circumstances were unhappy or oppressive, thousands were ready to seek their fortunes in war; whoever, for less honourable reasons, was expelled from society, followed the drum, and gained his livelihood under any colours he pleased. The Bohemian exiles were found in thousands in all the armies which fought against Austria. The Irish were as

numerous in those of their opponents; it was the same with the Walloons.... The Germans were pretty equally distributed on both sides.

It was Wallenstein's forte to form an army out of such elements; and, when every other bond of union failed, to make himself their centre.

In this respect no army was equal to his; no one succeeded as he did in casting the whole in one mould, in inspiring the native soldiers with an *esprit de corps*, and in making himself the centre of the hirelings, and of the army as a whole. For the rest, he was one of those characters who rise up in times like these—an upstart, who, from a modest position, had become a magnate, with principalities under him; yet he was coarse by nature, and never knew any other motive than thirst for power.

Wallenstein took the field openly, with the purpose of carrying on the war on his own responsibility, and for his own fame, and therefore of altogether ignoring, or if possible, of eclipsing the army of the League under Tilly, which to the great terror of the inhabitants, had been encamping for months in Lower Saxony. Tilly, pressed by Christian IV, wandered about in despair, his army near dissolution from sickness, want, and desertion, and he looked in vain for help either from home or from Wallenstein.

Seldom have great historical events followed in such close connection as in this case. During the same days of June when the Emperor was guilty of the imprudence of sacrificing Wallenstein to the League, Gustavus Adolphus landed on the shores of the Baltic, in order to summon the threatened Protestant elements under his banner.

[The Protestant general, Mansfeld, and Christian IV, however, were soon defeated, and Wallenstein and Tilly gained decisive victories in Northern Germany. But Wallenstein had made himself so hated that at the demand of the German princes, Ferdinand dismissed him. Later, Ferdinand recalled him on astounding terms.]

Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden

If it can be said of any ruler in the first half of the seventeenth century, that he was filled with Protestant zeal and sincere enthusiasm for the greatness of his cause, it may be said of him, and of him alone. To a world full of mean artifices, miserable intrigues, and narrow-minded men, he exhibited once more the qualities and characteristics of a true hero. It was this which conferred on the war of 1630 a peculiar greatness, notwithstanding its short duration, and caused it soon to lose the character of mere invasion. Gustavus Adolphus became a leading personage, Sweden a commanding power in Europe. In the middle of February, 1632, Gustavus Adolphus advanced into the parts of Southern Germany which he had not before entered. The whole of Bavaria soon fell into the hands of the Swedes. The conquest of Germany up to the Austrian hereditary dominions was accomplished. Gustavus Adolphus advanced to Saxony. When he appeared in Thuringia and Saxony, where Wallenstein's troops had behaved atrociously, the people received him with acclamations. From November 6-16, [1632] he encountered Wallenstein in the same plains where he had fought his first battle, near Lützen.

The battle which took place here was one of the most severe and sanguinary of the whole war. Command was at first difficult, for a thick fog lay upon the plain, which did not clear off till ten o'clock. The morning passed without a decision. The Swedes sprang over the trenches and broke one of the imperial squares, but were forced to retreat again. Both sides fought with the greatest valour, but the combat still remained undecided. The King had for a long time disused armour, on account of his corpulence, and wore a light leather jerkin. His idea was, God is with us, and if it is His will to protect us He can do so without armour. He was near-sighted, and, as ever in the thickest of the fray, he rode forward with but few companions, and got among a host of hostile cuirassiers. A shot struck his horse as he was dismounting; a second shot struck his arm. His companions were quickly dispersed; his two pages found it difficult to help him from his horse,

when a third shot struck him, which seems to have been fatal. The page who was last at his side, related that while he was helping the King to dismount, hostile cuirassiers came up and asked who the wounded man was; that he would not say; but that the King made himself known, and then some one shot him through the head. The page himself was fatally wounded, and died a few hours afterwards.

It was not until his horse sprang riderless over the plain that the news spread among the Swedes, "The King is dead...." With fearful rage the Swedes now threw themselves upon the enemy, and during the evening hours the imperial army was totally defeated. The victory was won, but at what a price!

But the cause for which Gustavus Adolphus fought did not die with him. The course of events preserved the stamp which he had impressed upon them. The effects of what he accomplished in two years were felt during the whole war; and when peace was concluded, sixteen years afterwards. the essential features of his plan were realized.

On his death this unity between warfare and policy was at an end. There were two parties in the Swedish camp, one represented by the Chancellor Oxenstierna, a statesman who, always keeping in view the political objects of the war, urged as speedy a decision as possible; the other by the greater number of the superior officers, whose interest lay in advancing their own supremacy by an aimless continuance of the war.

The Swedes were thus lamed by want of unity amongst their leaders, the Imperialists by Wallenstein's treachery and catastrophe.²⁰ But the second half of 1634 brought a change; and now Richelieu secured the command which for four years had been persistently refused him. The affairs of Sweden and Germany are henceforth indissolubly connected with French policy.

Cardinal Richelieu

The self-denying subjection of Louis the Thirteenth 1610-1643, (son of Henry IV) to a minister whom he did not like, is

²⁰ Wallenstein, suspected of treason by Ferdinand, was assassinated.

unique in history. It arose from an idea that Richelieu was the man to establish the greatest monarchy in the world.

In the seventeenth century the ecclesiastical power had still weight enough to accomplish more than the secular arm, and it is certain that Richelieu could not have ventured on many of the things which he did, without the clerical garb.

Richelieu was resolved to sever the bond with Spain, and to round off France at the expense of the German Empire. His ambition was the greatness of France; all that was French was his interest; all that was opposed to him was opposed to France.

If the genuine French idea were once conceived, of keeping down the old Hapsburgian rival, alliances would follow as a matter of course. England, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, the German Protestants, all the heretics in the world were desirable allies to help to oppose Spain.

Richelieu had labored unceasingly to gain an influence in the German difficulties; Gustavus Adolphus had accepted his aids, (subsidies) but absolutely forbidden any interference with his plans. After the King's death, Oxenstierna had hoped to keep the French co-operation within the same limits, and to a certain extent he succeeded. But after the defeat of Nordlingen²¹ all this was changed. Richelieu was no longer a burdensome interloper to be outwitted, but a desired ally for a little help from whom, great sacrifices must be made.

The Treaty of Westphalia, 1648

Sweden and France were the leaders of opposite parties. Sweden was the mouthpiece of the Protestants and of every Protestant interest. France was, of course, on the other side. It was for her interest that the Protestant princes of Germany should not be annihilated, for they were the natural enemies of Spain and the Hapsburgs; but it was by no means her interest to allow Protestantism so to increase that it might become dangerous to the creed of France.

²¹ There, the Imperial Army, in 1634, defeated the Swedes. We omit the tiresome details of the coalitions, intrigues, and campaigns of the following ten years.

This was the curiously disjointed way in which the most important parties at the congress were grouped. Sweden secured the adhesion of all Protestant, France of all Catholic elements; but the Emperor, both on religious and political questions, had all parties against him, or, at any rate, none for him.

The negotiations continued till the conclusion of peace, on the 24th of October, 1648. France treated with the Emperor at Münster, Sweden at Osnabrück, and had come to terms.

[The principal provisions were that each ruler might choose for his own state the Catholic, or Lutheran or Calvinist religion; that the independence of the Netherlands and of Switzerland was recognized; that France obtained all of Alsace (except the city of Strasburg) and the cities of Metz, Verdun, and Toul in Lorraine; that the King of Sweden became a Prince of the German Empire with three votes in the German Diet, and control of some lands in northern Germany.]

These peace transactions, in which all the European powers took part, completed the emancipation of the western world from the traditions of the Middle Ages, and introduced the new era of European balance of power.

The descriptions of the misery inflicted by this war everywhere in Germany are heartrending. The conduct of the soldiers towards the defenceless citizens and peasants, was so horribly barbarous that it seemed to be their object literally to destroy the whole population. The devastation of the country was fearful. Especially in the south and west, Germany was a wilderness of ruins. It is estimated by some that the population was diminished by twenty, or even by fifty percent.

The power which the German and Spanish Hapsburgs had wielded since the times of Charles V and Philip II, and for which they contended for the last time during this war, was now thrown entirely into the background by their two more fortunate rivals. Spain was thoroughly disabled, and the authority of the Emperor in the empire reduced to a shadow. The union between Imperialism and the Papacy to oppose church reform was forever at an end. An era begins of national consolidated governments, with a

new policy both foreign and domestic. For both these tendencies France became the standard in the spirit inaugurated by Richelieu.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND¹

John Wyclif, 1324?-1384

Wyclif had already reached middle age when he was appointed to the mastership of Balliol College, in the University of Oxford, and was recognized as first among the schoolmen of his day. The decay of the University of Paris during the English wars had transferred her intellectual supremacy to Oxford, and in Oxford Wyclif stood without a rival.

His debt to Ockham² revealed itself in his earliest efforts at Church reform. Undismayed by the thunder and excommunications of the Church, Ockham had not shrunk in his enthusiasm for the Empire from attacking the foundations of the Papal supremacy or from asserting the rights of the civil power. The spare, emaciated frame of Wyclif, weakened by study and by asceticism, hardly promised a reformer who would carry on the stormy work of Ockham; but within this frail form lay a temper quick and restless, an immense energy, an immovable conviction, an unconquerable pride. The personal charm which ever accompanies real greatness only deepened the influence he derived from the spotless purity of his life.

The attack of Wyclif began precisely at the moment when the Church of the Middle ages had sunk to its lowest point of spiritual decay. The transfer of the Papacy (to Avignon) robbed it of much of the awe in which it had been held, for not only had the Popes sunk into creatures of the French King, but their greed and extortion produced almost universal revolt.

¹ This subject should have preceded that of the Reformation in Germany, but in order to keep the topics on England together as much as possible, we have delayed the study of Wyclif until now. We quote from Green's *Short History of England*.

² William Occam or Ockham was an English Franciscan, a lecturer in the University of Paris. He aided Louis of Bavaria against Pope John XXII. He died probably in 1349 at Munich.

The protest of the Good Parliament (April 1376) asserted that the taxes levied by the Pope amounted to five times the amount of those levied by the King.

At this very time the deaneries of Litchfield, Salisbury, and York, the archdeaconry of Canterbury, which was reputed the wealthiest English benefice, together with a host of prebends and preferments, were held by Italian cardinals and priests, while the Pope's collector from his office in London sent twenty thousand marks a year to the Papal treasury.

If extortion and tyranny such as this severed the English clergy from the Papacy, their own selfishness severed them from the nation at large. Immense as was their wealth, they bore as little as they could of the common burdens of the realm.

Their moral authority was rapidly passing away; the wealthiest churchmen, with curled hair and hanging sleeves, aped the costume of the knightly society to which they really belonged. The general impression of their worldliness is seen in Chaucer's picture of the hunting monk and the courtly prioress with her love-motto on her brooch. Over the vice of the higher classes they exerted no influence whatever.

Wyclif defended the Parliament's indignant refusal of the "tribute" which was claimed by the Papacy, the expulsion of the bishops from office by the Duke of Lancaster, and the taxation of Church lands.

Some months before the outbreak of Wat Tyler's rebellion, Wyclif had by one memorable step passed from the position of a reformer of the discipline and political relations of the Church, to that of a protestant against its cardinal beliefs. If there was one doctrine upon which the supremacy of the Mediaeval Church rested, it was the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It was by his exclusive right to the performance of the miracle which was wrought in the mass that the lowliest priest was raised high above princes. With the formal denial of the doctrine of Transubstantiation which Wyclif issued in the spring of 1381 began that great movement of revolt which ended, more than a century after, in

the establishment of religious freedom, by severing the mass of the Teutonic peoples from the general body of the Catholic Church. The act was the bolder that he stood utterly alone. The University, in which his influence had been hitherto all-powerful, at once condemned him. John of Gaunt enjoined him to be silent. Wyclif at once challenged Chancellor or doctor to disprove the conclusions at which he had arrived. The prohibition of the Duke of Lancaster he met by an open avowal of his teaching, a confession which closes proudly with the quiet words, "I believe that in the end the truth will conquer." For the moment his courage dispelled the panic around him. The University responded to his appeal, and by displacing his opponents from office tacitly adopted his cause. But Wyclif no longer looked for support to the learned or wealthier classes on whom he had hitherto relied. He appealed, and the appeal is memorable as the first of such a kind in our history, to England at large. With an amazing industry he issued tract after tract in the tongue of the people itself. The dry, syllogistic Latin, the abstruse and involved argument which the great doctor had addressed to his academic hearers, were suddenly flung aside, and by a transition which marks the wonderful genius of the man, the schoolman was transformed into the pamphleteer. If Chaucer is the father of our later English poetry, Wyclif is the father of our later English prose. The rough, clear, homely English of his tracts, the speech of the ploughman and the trader of the day, though coloured with the picturesque phraseology of the Bible, is in its literary use as distinctly a creation of his own as the style in which he embodied it, the terse vehement sentences, the stinging sarcasms, the hard antitheses which roused the dullest mind like a whip. Once fairly freed from the trammels of unquestioning belief, Wyclif's mind worked fast in its career of scepticism. Pardons, indulgences, absolutions, pilgrimages to the shrines of the saints, worship of their images, worship of the saints themselves, were successively denied. A formal appeal to the Bible as the one ground of faith, coupled with an assertion of the right of every instructed man to examine the Bible himself,

threatened the very groundwork of the older dogmatism with ruin. Nor were these daring denials confined to the small circle of the scholars who still clung to him; with the practical ability which is so marked a feature of his character, Wyclif had organized, some few years before, an order of poor preachers, "the Simple Priests," whose coarse sermons and long russet dress moved the laughter of the clergy, but who now formed a priceless organization for the diffusion of their master's doctrines. How rapid their progress must have been we may see from the panic-struck exaggerations of their opponents; a few years later every second man you met, they complain, was a Lollard; the followers of Wyclif abounded everywhere and in all classes, among the baronage, in the cities, among the peasantry of the country-side, even in the monastic cell itself.

"Lollard," a word which probably means much the same as "idle babbler," was the nickname of scorn with which the orthodox Churchmen chose to insult their assailants. But this rapid increase changed their scorn into vigorous action. Courtenay, now became Archbishop, summoned a council at Blackfriars, and formally submitted twenty-four propositions drawn from Wyclif's works. An earthquake in the midst of the proceedings terrified every prelate but the resolute Primate; the expulsion of ill humours from the earth, he said, was of good omen for the expulsion of ill humours from the Church; and the condemnation was pronounced. Then the Archbishop turned fiercely upon Oxford as the fount and centre of the new heresies.

[Oxford almost as a unit supported the reformers.]

The Crown however at last stepped roughly in, and a royal writ ordered the instant banishment of all favorers of Wyclif, with the seizure and destruction of all Lollard books, on pain of forfeiture of the University's privileges. The threat produced its effect. Within Oxford itself the suppression of Lollardism was complete, but with the death of religious freedom all trace of intellectual life suddenly disappears. The century which followed is the most barren in its annals, nor was the sleep of the University

broken, till the advent of the New Learning restored to it some of the life and liberty which had so roughly been trodden out.

For a time Wyclif's opponents seemed satisfied with his expulsion from the University, but in his retirement at Lutterworth he was forging during these troubled years the great weapon which, wielded by other hands than his own, was to produce so terrible an effect on the triumphant hierarchy. An earlier translation of the whole Bible, in part of which he was aided by his scholar Herford, was being revised and brought to the second form, which is better known as "Wyclif's Bible," when death drew near.

The terrible strain on energies enfeebled by age and study had at last brought its inevitable result, and a stroke of paralysis while Wyclif was hearing mass in his parish church at Lutterworth was followed on the next day by his quiet death. (December 31, 1384.)³

³ Forty-four years after Wyclif's death, that is in 1428, was carried out the decree of the Council of Constance, 1415, that his body should be disinterred, and burned. Fuller in his *Church History of Britain* says that the ashes were thrown into the brook that flowed past the parsonage at Lutterworth and that "this brook did convey his ashes into the Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the sea and that into the ocean. And so the ashes of Wyclif are the emblem of his doctrine, which is now dispersed all the world over."

XXII—ENGLAND UNDER THE TUDORS

Henry the Seventh,⁴ 1485-1509

The introduction of gunpowder had ruined feudalism. The mounted and heavily-armed knight gave way to the meaner footman. Fortresses which had been impregnable against the attacks of the Middle Ages crumbled before the new artillery. Artillery gave Henry the Seventh his easy victory over a rising of the Cornish insurgents, the most formidable danger which threatened his throne. The strength which the change gave to the Crown was, in fact, almost irresistible. Throughout the Middle Ages the call of a great baron had been enough to raise a formidable revolt. Yeomen and retainers took down the bow from their chimney corner, knights buckled on their armor, and in a few days an army threatened the throne. But without artillery such an army was now helpless, and the one train of artillery in the kingdom lay at the disposal of the King. It was the consciousness of his strength which enabled the new sovereign to quietly resume the policy of Edward the Fourth.

It was faithfully followed, and Parliament was only once convened during the last thirteen years of Henry's reign.

The chief aim indeed of the King appeared to be the accumulation of a treasure which should relieve him from the need of appealing for its aid. The discontinuance of Parliament was followed by the revival of Benevolences. A dilemma⁵ of his favorite minister, which received the name of "Morton's Fork," extorted gifts to the exchequer from men who lived handsomely, on the ground that their wealth was manifest, and from those who lived plainly, on the plea that economy had made them wealthy. So successful were these efforts that at the end of his reign Henry bequeathed a hoard of two millions to his successor.

The same imitation of Edward's policy was seen in Henry's civil government. Broken as was the strength of the baronage,

⁴ See page 276.

⁵ Here: two alternatives

there still remained lords whom the new monarch watched with a jealous solicitude. Their power lay in the hosts of disorderly retainers who swarmed round their houses, ready to furnish a force in case of revolt. Edward had ordered the dissolution of these military households in his Statute of Liveries, and the statute was enforced by Henry with the utmost severity. On a visit to the Earl of Oxford, the King found two long lines of liveried retainers drawn up to receive him. "I thank you for your good cheer, my Lord," said Henry as they parted, "but I may not endure to have my laws broken in my sight. My attorney must speak with you." The Earl was glad to escape with a fine of £10,000.

But steady as was the drift of Henry's policy in the direction of despotism, we see no traces of originality or genius. His temper, silent, jealous, but essentially commonplace, was content to follow out, tamely and patiently, the plans of Edward. He looked with dread and suspicion on the one movement which broke the apathy of his reign, the great intellectual revolution which bears the name of the Revival of Letters.

Henry the Eighth,⁶ 1509-1547

The hopes of the little group of scholars⁷ were held in check during the life of Henry VII by his suspicion and ill-will, but a "New Order" to use their own enthusiastic term, dawned on them with the accession of his son. Henry the Eighth had hardly completed his eighteenth year when he mounted the throne, but the beauty of his person, his vigor and skill in arms, seemed only matched by the generosity of his temper and the nobleness of his political aims. The abuses of the previous reign, the extortion of the Royal treasury, were at once remedied. No accession ever excited higher expectations among a people than that of Henry the Eighth.

⁶ Henry the Seventh's eldest son Arthur (who had married Catherine of Aragon, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella) had died.

⁷ John Colet, Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, William Tyndale should be assigned as special topics.

His sympathies were from the first openly on the side of the New Learning; for Henry was not only himself a fair scholar, but even in boyhood had roused by his wit and attainments the wonder of Erasmus. The great scholar hurried back to England to pour out his exultation in the "Praise of Folly," his song of triumph over the old world of ignorance and bigotry which was to vanish away before the light and knowledge of the new reign.

Henry the Eighth clung to his father's policy of an alliance with Spain; and a Papal dispensation enabled him to marry Catherine, his brother's widow.

Henry VIII seeks a divorce from Catherine

As a princess of Spain, and aunt to the Emperor, the Queen, Catherine of Aragon, stood at the head of the Spanish party. But the death of child after child, and the want of a son, had already roused a superstitious dread in Henry's mind that his marriage with a brother's widow, though sanctioned by the Church, was marked with the curse of Heaven. It was probably at the suggestion of Cardinal Wolsey⁸ that doubts were expressed as to the validity of the King's marriage and on the legitimacy of its issue, the Lady Mary. Wolsey was looking forward, not only to a breach with the Emperor, but to supplying Catherine's place with a princess of France.

But the desires of Henry outran the policy of his minister. Henry's conscientious scruples were suddenly quickened by the charms of Anne Boleyn, a young lady of his Court; and this passion, neglected and despised by Wolsey, was skillfully fanned by the support of the Duke of Norfolk, with whose family Anne Boleyn was connected. Henry suddenly announced to the Cardinal his resolve on the new union.

The most learned English bishop declared openly against it. The English theologians referred the King to the Pope for a decision of the question. The commercial classes shrank from a step

⁸ A special topic or general assignment should be given on Wolsey. Charles V was, of course, the Emperor at this time.

which involved an irretrievable breach with the Emperor, who was master of their great market in Flanders. Above all, the iniquity of the proposal jarred against the public conscience. But neither danger nor shame availed against the King's wilfulness and passion. Norfolk and Anne Boleyn's father who gained more and more the upper hand in the Council, pushed the divorce resolutely on. It was in vain that Pope Clement the Seventh, perplexed at once by his wish to gratify Henry, his own conscientious doubts as to the possibility of the course proposed, and his terror of the Emperor, whose power was now predominant in Italy, suggested that the King should act on his own responsibility. Henry was resolute in demanding a legal declaration of the invalidity of the Papal bull on which his first marriage rested, and the Pope was forced at last to issue a commission for a trial of the facts.

The Cardinals pressed on Catherine the expediency of her withdrawal to a religious house, while Henry pressed on the Pope that of a settlement of the matter by his formal declaration against the validity of the marriage. It was not till both efforts had failed that the Court met at the Blackfriars. The case proceeded; but Clement, who was now wholly in the Emperor's hands, had already cited it before him at Rome; and the Cardinals, though as yet ignorant of the Pope's decision, decided on an adjournment for the purpose of consulting him as to the judgment they should pronounce.

Henry, who had throughout suspected Wolsey of being no friend to his project, was furious at the sudden scruples of conscience which frustrated his will. Wolsey was at once banished from the Court. He was prostrated by the blow. He offered to give up everything he possessed if the King would but cease from his displeasure. Pardon was granted him on the surrender of his vast possessions to the Crown, and he was ordered at once to proceed to his Archbishopric, the one dignity he was suffered to retain. But hardly a year had passed before his popularity in the north revived the jealousy of his political rivals, and on the eve of his installation-feast he was arrested on a charge of high treason

and conducted by the Lieutenant of the Tower towards London. Already broken by his enormous labors, by internal disease, and the sense of his fall, the old man accepted the arrest as a sentence of death. An attack of illness forced him to rest at the Abbey of Leicester. On his death-bed his thoughts still clung to the prince whom he had served. "He is a Prince," said he, "of a most royal courage: sooner than miss any part of his will, he will endanger one half of his kingdom. Had I served God as diligently as I have served the King, He would not have given me over in my grey hairs."

The ten years which follow the fall of Wolsey are among the most momentous in English history. The New Monarchy at last realised its power, and the work for which Wolsey had paved the way was carried out with a terrible thoroughness. The one great institution which could still offer resistance to the Royal will was struck down. The Church became a mere instrument of the central despotism. The people learned their helplessness in rebellions easily suppressed and avenged with ruthless severity. A reign of terror, organized with consummate and merciless skill, held England panic-stricken at Henry's feet. The noblest heads rolled on the block, Virtue and learning could not save Thomas More. The execution of queen after queen taught England that nothing was too high for Henry's "courage," or too sacred for his "appetite." Parliament assembled only to sanction acts of unscrupulous tyranny, or to build up by its own statutes the great fabric of absolute rule. All the constitutional safeguards of English freedom were swept away. Arbitrary taxation, arbitrary legislation, arbitrary imprisonment were powers claimed without dispute and unsparingly exercised by the Crown.

The Act of Supremacy, 1534

Despair of other means drove Henry at last to adopt the bold plan to disavow the Papal jurisdiction, declare himself Head of the Church within his realm, and obtain a divorce from his own Ecclesiastical Courts. The clergy were told that forgiveness [they

were considered accessory to Wolsey's action] could be bought at no less price than the payment of a fine amounting to a million of our present money, and the acknowledgement of the King as "Protector and only Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England." To the first demand they at once submitted; against the second they struggled hard.

The expulsion of Catherine from the King's palace gave emphasis to the demand. While still suggesting a compromise as to the main point at issue, Clement boldly rebuked Henry for his relations with Anne Boleyn, who had taken her rival's place in the King's palace; and ordered him to restore Catherine, till the cause was tried, to her lawful position as Queen. By a brief which was posted on the church doors in Flanders, he inhibited him, on pain of excommunication, from seeking a divorce in his own English Courts, or from contracting a new marriage. Henry replied, not merely by a secret union with Anne Boleyn, but by a Statute of Appeals, which forbade all further processes in the Court of Rome and annihilated, as far as his English subjects were concerned, the judicial jurisdiction of the Papacy. Cranmer, an active partisan of the divorce, was named to the See of Canterbury; proceedings were at once commenced in his Court; and the marriage of Catherine was formally declared invalid by the new Primate. A week later Cranmer set on the brow of Anne Boleyn the crown which she had so long coveted.

The Act of Supremacy ordered that the King "shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme Head on earth of the Church of England...." The clergy learned by injunction after injunction that they were regarded, and must learn to regard themselves, as mere mouthpieces of the Royal will. The restriction of the right of preaching to priests who received licenses from the Crown silenced every voice of opposition.

The Bible was formally adopted as the basis of English faith. As a preliminary measure the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments were at once translated into English, and ordered to be taught by every schoolmaster and father of a family to his children or pupils.

The Dissolution of the Monasteries

As an outlet for religious enthusiasm, indeed, monasticism was practically dead. The friar, now that his fervor of devotion and his intellectual energy had passed away, had sunk into a mere beggar. The monks had become mere land-owners. Most of their houses were anxious only to enlarge their revenues and to diminish the number of those who shared them. Two Royal Commissioners, had been despatched on a general visitation of the religious houses, and their reports formed a "Black Book" which was laid before Parliament on their return. It was acknowledged that about a third of the religious houses, including the bulk of the larger abbeys, were fairly and decently conducted. The rest were charged with drunkenness, with simony, and with the foulest and most revolting crimes. The character of the visitors, the sweeping nature of their report, and the long debate which followed on its reception, leaves little doubt that the charges were grossly exaggerated, but there is no ground for believing them to have been wholly untrue. The want of any effective discipline, which had resulted from their exemption from any but Papal supervision, told fatally against monastic morality. But in spite of the cry of "Down with them" which broke from the Commons as the report was read, the country was still far from desiring the utter downfall of the monastic system. A long and bitter debate was followed by a compromise which suppressed all houses whose income fell below £200 a year, and granted their revenues to the Crown; but the great abbeys were still preserved intact.

The old English liberties lay prostrate at the feet of the King. The Lords were powerless, the House of Commons was filled with the creatures of the Court, and degraded into the mere machine of tyranny. Royal proclamations were taking the place of parliamentary legislation, benevolences were encroaching more and more on the right of parliamentary taxation. The new religious changes had thrown an almost sacred character over the "majesty" of the King. Henry was the Head of the Church. From the primate to the meanest deacon every minister of it derived from him his sole

right to exercise spiritual powers. The voice of its preachers was the mere echo of his will. He alone could define orthodoxy or declare heresy. The forms of its worship and belief were changed and rechanged at the royal caprice. Half of its wealth went to swell the royal treasury, and the other half lay at the King's mercy. It was this concentration of all power in the hands of a single man that over-awed the imagination of Henry's subjects. He was regarded as something high above the laws which govern common men. The voice of statesmen and of priests extolled his wisdom and power as more than human. The Parliament itself rose and bowed to the vacant throne when his name was mentioned. An absolute devotion to his person replaced the old loyalty to law.

The short-lived royalty of Anne Boleyn had ended in charges of adultery and treason, and in her death in May, 1536. Her rival and successor in Henry's affections, Jane Seymour, died the next year in child-birth.

Henry, bitterly as he had disappointed its hopes, remained the steady friend of the New Learning. Through all the strange changes of his terrible career the King's Court was the home of letters. Even as a boy, his son, Edward the Sixth, was a fair scholar in both the classical languages. His daughter Mary wrote good Latin letters. Elizabeth, who spoke French and Italian as fluently as English, began every day with an hour's reading in the Greek Testament, the tragedies of Sophocles, or the orations of Isocrates and Demosthenes.

In the last hours of his life Henry proved himself true to the work he had begun. He offered to unite in a "League Christian" with the German Princes. He suddenly consented to the change, suggested by Cranmer, of the Mass into a Communion Service. He flung the Duke of Norfolk into the Tower as a traitor, and placed the Earl of Hertford, who was known as a patron of the Protestants, at the head of the Council of Regency which he nominated at his death.

Catherine Howard atoned like Anne Boleyn for her unchastity by a traitor's death; her successor on the throne, Catherine Parr,

had the luck to outlive the King. But of Henry's seven marriages only three children survived; Mary Tudor, the daughter of Catherine of Aragon, Elizabeth Tudor, the daughter of Anne Boleyn, and Edward Tudor, the boy of ten who now ascended the throne as Edward the Sixth, Henry's son by Jane Seymour.

Edward VI 1547-1553 (Lord Hertford, later Duke of Somerset, Protector)

The will of Henry had placed Jane's brother, Lord Hertford, at the head of a Council of Regency in which the adherents of the old and new system were carefully balanced; but Hertford's first act was to expel the former from the Council, and to seize the whole Royal power with the title of Protector, Hertford's personal weakness forced him at once to seek for popular support by measures which marked the first retreat of the New Monarchy from the position of pure absolutism which it had reached under Henry.

"This year," says a contemporary, "the Archbishop of Canterbury did eat meat openly in Lent in the Hall of Lambeth, the like of which was never seen since England was a Christian country." This significant act was followed by a rapid succession of sweeping changes. The legal prohibitions of Lollardry were removed; the Six Articles were repealed; a royal injunction removed all pictures and images from the churches; priests were permitted to marry; the new Communion which had taken the place of the Mass was ordered to be administered in the English tongue; an English book of Common Prayer, the Liturgy, which with slight alterations is still used in the Church of England, replaced the Missal and Breviary from which its contents are mainly drawn.

Revolt was everywhere stamped out in blood; but the weakness which the Protector had shown... ended in his fall. He was forced by his own party to resign, and his power passed to the Earl of Warwick, to whose ruthless severity the suppression of the revolt was mainly due.

The Forty-two Articles of Religion, which were now introduced, though since reduced by omissions to thirty-nine, have remained to this day the formal standard of doctrine in the English Church. The sufferings of the Protestants had failed to teach them the worth of religious liberty; and a new code of ecclesiastical laws, which was ordered to be drawn up by a board of Commissioners as a substitute for the Canon Law of the Catholic Church, although it shrank from the penalty of death, attached that of perpetual imprisonment or exile to the crimes of heresy, blasphemy, and adultery, and declared excommunication to involve a severance of the offender from the mercy of God, and his deliverance into the tyranny of the devil. . . . The distaste for changes so hurried, and so rigorously enforced, was increased by the daring speculations of the more extreme Protestants. The real value of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century to mankind lay, not in its substitution of one creed for another, but in the new spirit of inquiry, the new freedom of thought and of discussion, which was awakened during the process of change. But however familiar such a truth may be to us, it was absolutely hidden from the England of the time.

One noble measure indeed, the foundation of eighteen Grammar Schools, was destined to throw a lustre over the name of Edward, but it had no time to bear fruit in his reign. All that men saw was religious and political chaos, in which ecclesiastical order had perished, and in which politics were dying down into the squabbles of a knot of nobles over the spoils of the Church and the Crown.

Lady Jane Grey

The waning health of Edward warned Warwick, who had now become Duke of Northumberland, of an unlooked-for danger. Mary, the daughter of Catherine of Aragon, who had been placed next in succession to Edward by her father's will, remained firm amidst all the changes of the time to the older faith.

The bigotry of the young king was easily brought to consent to a daring scheme by which Mary's rights might be set aside. Edward's "plan," as Northumberland dictated it, annulled the will of his father. It set aside both Mary and Elizabeth, who stood next in the will, as illegitimates. It named Jane Grey, the eldest grandchild of Henry the Eighth's sister Mary, as Edward's successor. The marriage of Jane Grey with Guildford Dudley, the fourth son of Northumberland, was all that was needed to complete the unscrupulous plot. The consent of the judges and council to her succession was extorted by the violence of the Duke, and the new sovereign was proclaimed, on Edward's death, July 6, 1553.

Jane Grey had acquired a degree of learning rare in matured men. Her character had developed with her talents. At fifteen she was learning Hebrew and could write Greek; at sixteen she corresponded with Bullinger in Latin at least equal to his own; but the matter of her letters is more striking than the language. She has left a portrait of herself drawn by her own hand; a portrait of piety, purity, and free, noble innocence.

But the temper of the whole people rebelled against so lawless a usurpation. The eastern counties rose as one man to support Mary; and when Northumberland marched from London with ten thousand at his back to crush the rising, the Londoners, Protestant as they were, showed their ill-will by a stubborn silence. The Duke's courage suddenly gave way, and he himself threw his cap into the air and shouted with his men for Queen Mary. But his submission failed to avert his doom; and the death of Northumberland drew with it the imprisonment in the Tower of the innocent and hapless girl whom he had made the tool of his ambition.

Her unhappy father rushed to his daughter's room. He clutched at the canopy under which she was sitting, and tore it down; she was no longer queen, he said, and told her of the revolt of the council. She replied that his present words were more welcome to her than those in which he advised her to accept the crown; her reign being at an end, she asked innocently if she might

leave the Tower and go home. But the Tower was a place not easy to leave, save by one route too often travelled.⁹

Mary Tudor 1553-1558

Meanwhile the Lords, with the mayor and the heralds went to the Cross at Cheapside to proclaim Mary queen. This time there was no reason to complain of a silent audience. "God save the Queen," "God save the Queen," rang from thousands of throats. The glad news spread like lightning through London, and the pent-up hearts of the citizens poured themselves out in a torrent of exultation.

Mary began to move slowly towards London, and at the end of the month she reached her old house of Newhall in Essex, where she rested till the preparations were complete for her entry into the city.

Thursday, August 3, she entered London. Excitement lent to her hard features an expression almost of beauty, as she rode in the midst of a splendid cavalcade of knights and nobles. Elizabeth, escorted by two thousand horse and a retinue of ladies, was waiting to receive her outside the gates. The first in her congratulations, after the proclamation, yet fearful of giving offence, Elizabeth had written to ask if it was the queen's pleasure that she should appear in mourning; but the queen would have no mourning, nor would have others wear it in her presence. The sombre colours which of late years had clouded the court, were to be banished at once and for ever; and with the dark colours, it seemed for a time as if old dislikes and suspicions were at the same time to pass away. The sisters embraced; the queen was warm and affectionate, kissing all the ladies in Elizabeth's train; and side by side the daughters of Henry VIII rode through Aldgate at seven in the evening, amidst the shouts of the people, the thunder of cannon, and pealing of church bells.

⁹ She was beheaded in February 1554. A very interesting special topic can be given based on the details of her life as given by Froude. For part of this account of Lady Jane Grey, we quote from James A. Froude's *History of England*, and for the history of the rest of the Tudor period we use both Froude and Green.

Elizabeth, now passing into womanhood, was the person to whom the affections of the liberal party in England most definitely tended. She was the heir-presumptive to the crown; in matters of religion she was opposed to the mass, and opposed as decidedly to factious and dogmatic Protestantism; while from the caution with which she had kept aloof from political entanglements, it was clear that her brilliant intellectual abilities were not her only or her most formidable gifts. Already she shared the favour of the people with her sister. Let Mary offend them, their entire hearts might be transferred to her.

In happier times Mary might have been a worthy queen, and Gardiner an illustrious minister; but the fatal superstition which confounded religion with orthodox opinion was too strong for both of them.

Mary flattered herself that, difficult though it might be, she could...reunite the country to Rome. Before she had been three weeks on the throne, she had received a secret messenger from the Vatican; and she had opened a correspondence with the Pope, entreating him, as an act of justice to herself and to those who had remained true to their Catholic allegiance, to remove the interdict.

But Mary was obliged to say, notwithstanding, that for the present she was in the power of the people, of whom the majority mortally detested the Holy See.

Emperor Charles V instructed his minister, Renard, to propose the Prince of Spain¹⁰ as a person whom the religious and political interests of the world alike recommended to Mary as a husband. The alliance of England, Spain, and Flanders would command a European supremacy; their united fleets would sweep the seas, and Scotland, deprived of support from France, must become an English province; while sufficient guarantees could be provided easily for the security of English liberties.

The council, the peers, the Commons, the voices of England, liberal and conservative alike, were opposed to Rome; Gardiner

¹⁰ Philip II.

was the only statesman in the country who thought a return to Catholic union practicable or desirable; while there was scarcely an influential family, titled or untitled, which was not, by grant or purchase, in possession of confiscated Church property.

There was an equal unanimity in the dread that if Mary became the wife of a Spanish sovereign, England would, like the Low Countries, sink into a provincial dependency; while, also, there was the utmost unwillingness to be again entangled in a European war. The country was exhausted, the currency ruined, the people in a state of unexampled suffering, and the only remedy was to be looked for in quiet and public economy. There were attractions in the offer of a powerful alliance, but the very greatness of it added to their reluctance; they desired to isolate England from European quarrels, and marry their queen at home.

On the other hand, though Gardiner held the restoration of the Papal authority to be tolerable, yet he dreaded the return of the Papal Legate Cardinal Reginald Pole, as being likely to supersede him in the direction of the English Church. The party who agreed with the Chancellor about the marriage, and about Pole, disagreed with him about the Pope; while Paget, who was in favor of the marriage, was with the lords on the supremacy, and, as the Romanizing views of the queen became notorious, was inclining towards the Protestants.

No wonder, therefore, that the whole council was in confusion and at cross purposes. No sooner were Charles's proposals definitely known than the entire machinery of the government was dislocated. Mary represented herself to Renard as without a friend whom she could trust.

Elizabeth's danger was great, and proceeded as much from her friends' indiscretion as from the hatred of her enemies. Renard was forever hissing his suspicions in Queen Mary's ear, and, unfortunately she was a too willing listener. Renard saw in Elizabeth the queen's most successful rival, the heir-presumptive to the crown, whose influence would increase the further the queen travelled on the road on which he was leading her, and, therefore, an enemy who, if possible, should be destroyed.

The Princess Elizabeth, alarmed perhaps at finding herself the unconsenting object of dangerous schemes, had asked permission to retire to her country house. It was agreed that she should go; persons in her household were bribed to watch her; and the queen, yielding to Renard's entreaties, received her when she came to take leave, with an appearance of affection so well counterfeited that it called out the ambassador's applause. She made Elizabeth a present of pearls, with a head-dress of sable; and the princess, on her side, implored the queen to give no more credit to slanders against her. They embraced; Elizabeth left the court; and, as she went out of London, five hundred gentlemen formed about her as voluntary escort. "There were not wanting fools" says Renard, "who would persuade the queen that her sister's last words were honestly spoken; but she remembers too acutely the injuries which her mother and herself suffered at Anne Boleyn's hands; and she has a fixed conviction that Elizabeth, unless she can be first disposed of, will be a cause of infinite calamities to the realm."

The Emperor in the beginning of December, sent over the draft of a marriage treaty. These demands were transmitted to Brussels, where they were accepted without difficulty. Secret messengers went off to Rome to hasten the dispensations—a dispensation for Mary to marry her cousin, and a dispensation permitting the ceremony to be performed by a bishop in a state of schism.

Philip, who was never remarkable for personal courage, may be pardoned for having come reluctantly to a country where he had to bring men-at-arms for servants, and his own cook for fear of being poisoned. The sea, too, was hateful to him, for he suffered miserably from sickness. Nevertheless, he was coming, and with him such a retinue of gallant gentlemen as the world had rarely seen together.¹¹

Mary's passion for Philip had been gratified. To complete

¹¹ The marriage took place at Winchester July, 1554.

her work and her happiness, it remained to bring back her subjects to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

The bishops were directed to call together their clergy in every diocese in England. A day was then fixed on which the clergy should appear with their confessions, and be received into the Church. When the clergy had been reconciled, they were again in turn to exhort the laity in all churches and cathedrals, to accept the grace which was offered to them; and that they might understand that they were not at liberty to refuse the invitation, a time was assigned to them within which their submission must be all completed. A book was to be kept in every diocese where the names of those who were received were to be entered.

The introduction of the Register was the Inquisition under another name. There was no limit, except in the humanity or the prudence of the bishops to the tyranny which they would be enabled to exercise.

On the 28th of August 1555 Philip went.¹² All evidence concurs to show that, after Philip's departure, Cardinal Pole was the single adviser on whom Mary relied. Is it to be supposed that, in the horrible crusade which thenceforward was the business of her life, the Papal legate, the sovereign director of the ecclesiastical administration of the realm, was not consulted, or, if consulted, that he refused his sanction?

A commission was appointed by Pole in September to try Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer,¹³ for obstinate heresy.

The archbishop was cited to appear at Rome within eighty days to answer to the charges which would there be laid against him; and in order that he might be able to obey the summons he was returned to his cell in Bocardo prison, and kept there in strict confinement.

Ridley and Latimer came next, and over them the Papal mantle flung no protection. They were brought to the bar, and

¹² After having been about a year in England, Philip left, never to return.

¹³ Thomas Cranmer was Archbishop of Canterbury, Ridley, Bishop of London and Latimer, Bishop of Worcester.

sentence was pronounced upon them, as heretics obstinate and incurable.

The place selected for the burning was outside the north wall of the town, a short stone's throw from the southward corner of Balliol College, and about the same distance from Bocardo prison, from which Cranmer was intended to witness his friends' sufferings.

The horrible sight worked upon the beholders as it has worked since, and will work forever, while the English nation survives—being notwithstanding, as in justice to those who caused these accursed cruelties, must never be forgotten—a legitimate fruit of the superstition, that, in the eyes of the Maker of the world, an error of belief is the greatest of crimes; that while for all other sins there is forgiveness, a mistake in the intellectual intricacies of speculative opinion will be punished not with the brief agony of a painful death, but with tortures to which there shall be no end.

But martyrdom was often but a relief from more barbarous atrocities. In the sad winter months which were approaching, the poor men and women, who untried and uncondemned were crowded into the bishops' prisons, experienced such miseries as the very dogs could scarcely suffer and survive. They were beaten, they were starved, they were flung into dark fetid dens, whose rotting straw was their bed, their feet were fettered in the stocks, and their clothes were their only covering, while the wretches who died in their misery were flung out into the fields where none might bury them.

In the midst of such scenes, the new parliament was about to meet. Money was wanted for the crown debts, and the queen was infatuated enough still to meditate schemes for altering the succession, or, at least, for obtaining the consent of the legislature to Philip's coronation, that she might bribe him back to her side.

As the opening of the session approached, [Oct. 21, 1555] Elizabeth was sent again from the court to be out of sight and out of reach of intrigue; and Mary had the mortification of knowing that her sister's passage through London was a triumphal procession. The public enthusiasm became so marked at last that the princess

was obliged to ride forward with a few servants, leaving the gentlemen who were her escort to keep back the people.

When the poor results of the session became known to Philip, he sent orders that such of his Spanish suite as he had left behind him should no longer afflict themselves with remaining in a country which they abhorred; he summoned them all to come to him except Alphonso, his confessor.

Nothing now was left for Mary but to make such use as she was able of the few years of life which were to remain to her. If Elizabeth, the hated Anne Boleyn's hated daughter, was to succeed her on the throne, and there was no remedy, it was for her to work so vigorously in the restoration of the Church that her labours could not afterwards be all undone. At her own expense she began to rebuild and refound the religious houses. The Grey Friars were replaced at Greenwich, the Carthusians at Sheene, the Brigittines at Sion. The house of the Knights of St. John in London was restored; the Dean and Chapter of Westminster gave way to Abbot Feckenham and a college of monks. Yet these touching efforts might soften her sorrow but could not remove it. Philip was more anxious than ever about the marriage of Elizabeth; and as Mary could not overcome her unwillingness to sanction by act of her own Elizabeth's pretensions, Philip wrote her cruel letters, and set his confessor to lecture her upon her duties as a wife. These letters she chiefly spent her time in answering, shut up almost alone, trusting no one but Pole, and seeing no one but her women. If she was compelled to appear in public, she had lost her power of self-control; she would burst into fits of violent and uncontrollable passion; she believed every one about her to be a spy in the interest of the Lords. So disastrously miserable were all the consequences of her marriage, that it was said, the Pope, who had granted the dispensation for the contraction of it, had better grant another for its dissolution. Unfortunately there was one direction open in which her frenzy could have uncontrolled scope.

Cranmer, had not yet expiated his personal offences against

the queen and her mother, and he was to drain the cup of humiliation to the dregs.¹⁴

The persecution . . . was degenerating into wholesale atrocity. On the 23d of April, [1556], six men were burnt at Smithfield; on the 28th, six more were burnt at Colchester; on the 15th of May, an old lame man and a blind man were burnt at Stratford-le-Bow. In the same month three women suffered at Smithfield, and a blind boy was burnt at Gloucester. In Guernsey, a mother and her two daughters were brought to the stake. . . . Reason, humanity, even common prudence, were cast to the winds. On the 27th of June, thirteen unfortunates, eleven men and two women, were destroyed together at Stratford-le-Bow, in the presence of twenty thousand people. A schoolmaster, in Norfolk, in July read an inflammatory proclamation in a church. He and three others were instantly hanged. Ferocity in the government and lawlessness in the people went hand in hand. Along the river bank stood rows of gibbets, with bodies of pirates swinging from them in the wind. In the autumn, sixty men were sentenced to be hanged together, for what crime is unknown, at Oxford; and as a symbol at headquarters of the system of the administration, four corpses of thieves hung as a spectacle of terror before the very gates of St. James's Palace.

On the 20th of August, twenty-three men and women were brought to London from Colchester, tied in a string with ropes to furnish another holocaust. A thousand people cheered them through the streets as they entered the city; and the symptoms of disorder were so significant and threatening, that Bonner wrote to Pole for instructions how he should proceed. The government was alarmed; "the council, not without good consideration," decided that it would be dangerous to go on with the executions; and Pole, checking Bonner's zeal, allowed the prisoners to escape for the time, under an easy form of submission which they could conscientiously take. They were dismissed to their homes, however, only for several of them to be slaughtered afterwards, under fresh

¹⁴ For the full story of his death at the stake see Froude VI. p 390-402.

pretexts, in detail; and Pole took an occasion, as will be presently seen, of reprimanding the citizens of London for their unnatural sympathy with God's enemies. That he had no objection to these large massacres, when they could be ventured safely, he showed himself in the following year, when fourteen heretics, of both sexes, were burnt in two days at Canterbury and Maidstone.....

The people sickened at the work of death.....Disease and famine quickened the general discontent which was roused when, in spite of the pledges given at her marriage, Mary dragged England into a war to support Philip—who on the Emperor's resignation had succeeded to his dominions of Spain, Flanders, and the New World—in a struggle against France. The war had hardly begun when, with characteristic secrecy and energy, the Duke of Guise flung himself upon Calais, and compelled it to surrender before succour could arrive. "The brightest jewel in the English crown," as all then held it to be, was suddenly reft away; and the surrender of Guisnes, which soon followed, left England without a foot of land on the Continent. But so profound was the discontent that even this blow failed to rally the country round the Queen. The forced loan to which she resorted came in slowly. The levies mutinied and dispersed. The death of Mary [Nov. 17, 1558] alone averted a general revolt, and a burst of enthusiastic joy hailed the accession of Elizabeth.

No English sovereign ever ascended the throne with larger popularity than Mary Tudor. The country was eager to atone to her for her mother's injuries; and the instinctive loyalty of the English towards their natural sovereign was enhanced by the efforts of Northumberland to rob her of her inheritance. She had reigned little more than five years, and she descended into the grave amidst curses deeper than the acclamations which had welcomed her accession. In that brief time she had swathed her name in the horrid epithet, Bloody Mary, which will cling to it forever; and yet from the passions which in general tempt sovereigns into crime, she was entirely free; to the time of her accession she had lived a blameless, and, in many respects, a noble life; and few men or

women have lived less capable of doing knowingly a wrong thing.

Had Mary been content with mild repression, had she left the Pope to those who loved him, and married, instead of Philip, some English lord, the mass would have retained its place, the clergy in moderate form would have resumed their old authority, and the Reformation would have waited for a century. In an evil hour, the queen listened to the unwise advisers, who told her that moderation in religion was the sin of the Laodiceans.

Elizabeth Tudor, 1558-1603

When Elizabeth a young untried woman of twenty-five was intrusted with the destiny of England, every course open to her was beset with objections. She could not stand still, she could move in no direction without offence to someone; and she herself in her own internal uncertainties was a type of the people whom she was set to rule.

On November 22, 1558, the Court removed to London. The last time that Elizabeth had travelled that road she was carried in a litter as a prisoner, could her sister's lawyers so compass it, to die upon the scaffold. Times had changed. Her sister's bishops came to meet her at Highgate. They were admitted to kiss hands—all but one: but from Bonner's lips she shrank as if contaminated by their approach, and in that evidence of her temper they read all their coming fate. No formal alteration could be ventured till the meeting of Parliament: but every hour brought with it some new indication that the moments were numbered of ecclesiastical dominion. The London mob tore down the new crucifixes. The Protestant clergy coming forth out of their hiding-places, began unpermitted to read the English services again. The Catholics clamored that they were being betrayed by Spain; and DeFeria¹⁵ could but write "that his worst fears were confirmed;" "that he was himself a cipher."

Personally and individually the dogmatism of Calvin was as distasteful to Elizabeth as the despotism of Rome. Innovation

¹⁵ Philip the Second's ambassador to England.

and change until sanctioned by Parliament were strictly forbidden by proclamation. The outline of the intended policy, however, became every day more clear; and the Spanish ambassador wrote with louder emphasis that England was lost and Elizabeth lost unless she was checked in the mad career on which she was entering. He did not anticipate the ultimate success of heresy. He believed only that the Queen, blinded by vanity, passion, and ill advice, was bringing on a catastrophe in which she must inevitably lose her throne to the Queen of Scots.¹⁶ Nothing could save her, nothing could prevent so disastrous a consequence, except her immediate marriage to some prince or nobleman in the Spanish interest.

To this matter therefore DeFeria's attention was now turned exclusively. On his first arrival in London the ambassador, regarding the Queen as the creature of his master, had spoken to her in a tone which she resented. High words had passed between them, and DeFeria had absented himself from Court. Elizabeth however was afraid to quarrel with him. In a few days she sent for him again, and affected to listen with interest to his proposals for her marriage. Philibert of Savoy had been already proposed and rejected while she was princess. There were the Austrian Archdukes, to either one of whom there was less objection. But the person desirable above all others for her in the eyes of Spanish statesmen, was Philip himself. There would be the true solution of all difficulties.

No foreign prince could be more anxious about her marriage than her own subjects. To Philip or Henry II of France the question was but of the balance of power in Europe, to the English it was life itself. There were many suitors—Philip, his cousin

¹⁶ The Catholic Church held that Catherine of Aragon had never been divorced from Henry the Eighth, and that at the death of Mary Tudor the only legal heir to the English throne was Mary Stuart, great-grand-daughter of Henry VII. Parliament had of course granted Henry VIII a divorce from Catherine, and had established the succession of Edward VI, Mary Tudor, and Elizabeth. The children of Henry Seventh were: Margaret born in 1489, who married James IV of Scotland, a Stuart; their son James V. married Mary Guise; their daughter was Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots; Henry VIII born in 1491; and Mary, born in 1498, whose granddaughter was Lady Jane Grey.

Philibert, the Austrian princes, and the King of Sweden. At home Arundel's name had been mentioned, and Sir William Pickering's. On the whole, the Queen was thought more likely to choose a subject than a foreigner; but the desire to see her married to some one was so great that the person seemed nothing in comparison. On the 6th of February the Speaker Sir. T. Gargrave, with the Privy-Council and thirty members of the House of Commons, demanded an audience, and without mentioning person or country they requested her in the name of the nation to take to herself a husband.

How Elizabeth received the petitioners is unknown, but she took time to consider her answer. . . . It was not till the morning of the 10th that the deputation was desired to return to the Queen's presence. She then said she most heartily thanked her faithful subjects for the care they showed for her. For herself, from the time when she had first determined to live for God's service, she had preferred to remain unmarried. There had been a time when her life was in danger. She would not blame her sister, nor although she had good grounds for suspicion would she name the person by whose advice her sister had acted; but it had seemed then as if her marriage alone could save her. Yet she had refused, and God, who had defended her before, she was confident would not desert her now. She approved of the form of the petition, which left her choice unfettered, and should it please God to incline her heart to another kind of life they might assure themselves she would do nothing of which the realm should have cause to complain. She intended to spend her own life for the good of her people, and if she married she would choose a husband who would be as careful for them as herself. If, on the contrary, she continued in her present mind she could not doubt but that with the help of Parliament the succession might be secured, and some "fit governor be provided, peradventure more beneficial to the realm than such offspring as might come of her." Children were uncertain blessings, and might grow up ungracious. For her it would be enough "that a marble stone should declare that a Queen having reigned such a time lived and died a virgin."

When pressed to say decisively whether she would marry Philip, Elizabeth at last refused. On the 20th of February, 1559, De Feria made his final effort. He spoke to her again of the Queen of Scots. He warned her that if Spain ceased to have an interest in England, the peace of Europe could not be sacrificed because her sister's carelessness had lost Calais. But "the devil," he said, "had taken possession of her."¹⁷

On the 11th of July the news arrived in London that the King of France, Henry II, was dead. Francis II and Mary Stuart were King and Queen of France. Throgmorton¹⁸ wrote that the Guises and the Queen of Scots ruled all in Paris. Mary Stuart herself was dexterous and energetic beyond her years. On the accession of Francis a question immediately arose whether the English quarterings were to be introduced into the great seal of France. After some discussion, and probably in some fear of Spain, it was decided that the young king himself should use only the usual arms; but Mary Stuart might keep the title which she had assumed, and in all her public acts thenceforward should style herself Queen of England. . . .

The French King and Queen were at Orleans holding a high court of Justice on the heretics there. Condé was under sentence of death and was about to be executed; the Calvinists all over the country were marked for massacre; when the keystone was struck suddenly from the arch which sustained the Guises' power. Francis the Second after a short illness died. Mary Stuart was a childless widow.

In January, the Scotch Estates met to receive Elizabeth's refusal of the Earl of Arran. Bothwell, Ogilvy, Leslie of Auchtermuchty, and others, had returned from Paris to be present. They brought with them as many as three hundred letters from the Queen (Mary Stuart) to different noblemen and gentlemen,

¹⁷ With diplomatic, though not to be admired, wisdom, Elizabeth had kept peace with various foreign countries of Europe by letting it be thought that she would soon marry some foreign noble or prince or king.

¹⁸ English Ambassador to France.

containing fair promises that henceforth she would know nothing but Scotland, and study only the greatness of her own subjects; the French that were left at Dunbar and Inchkeith should be withdrawn, and if her subjects would receive her she was ready to return and throw herself without reserve upon their loyalty. To each nobleman she had found something special, something gracious to say, something to lead him to believe that she had a peculiar interest in himself. She played on the passionate Scotch heart as upon an instrument of which she understood every note but one. She knew their feudal affection for their sovereign, their national pride, their jealousy of England, and she could appeal with certainty to her own position as a young and desolate widow; she comprehended all save the new, hard, insoluble element of religion; and so successful was she that the Estates began immediately to consider whether they would not invite her back among them. Randolph wrote that "all men were going after her"; that if Elizabeth desired to preserve a party in Scotland she must see to it promptly; and that if Mary Stuart returned "it would soon be a mad world."

Mary Stuart anticipated nothing but a splendid and speedy triumph. To the reiterated demands of Throgmorton for the ratification of the treaty agreeing to withdraw French soldiers from Scotland, she replied that she would send M. d'Oysel to London with a satisfactory answer. But he brought merely a request that the Queen of Scots on her way to Edinburgh might be allowed to pass through England.

For Elizabeth to have allowed a rival claimant of her crown, a Catholic, to pass three hundred miles through a population the most notoriously Romanist in the realm, would have been an act of political suicide. Elizabeth replied that when the treaty was ratified she would receive her cousin with pleasure.

Mary Stuart was evidently unprepared for the answer; she had anticipated a semi-regal progress through the northern counties. It was now uncertain whether she would attempt the passage of the Channel. The attitude she had chosen to assume was an

act of war against Elizabeth. The English Court no-doubt hoped that the fear alone might detain the Queen of Scots in France; but Mary resolved to sail direct for Leith, believing that with the escort of three of her uncles and the heir of the Montmorencies, Elizabeth would not dare to meddle with her.

She was not yet nineteen years old; but mind and body had matured amid the scenes in which she had passed her girlhood. Graceful alike in person and in intellect, she possessed that peculiar beauty in which the form is lost in the expression, and which every painter therefore has represented differently.

Rarely perhaps has any woman combined in herself so many noticeable qualities as Mary Stuart. . . . She had vigour, energy, tenacity of purpose, with perfect and never-failing self-possession; and as the one indispensable foundation for the effective use of all other qualities, she had indomitable courage. She wanted none either of the faculties necessary to conceive a great purpose, or of the abilities necessary to execute it, except perhaps only this,—that while she made politics the game of her life, it was a game only, though played for a high stake. In the deeper and nobler emotions she had neither share nor sympathy.

Here lay the vital difference between the Queen of Scots and her great rival, and here was the secret of the difference of their fortunes. In intellectual gifts Mary Stuart was at least Elizabeth's equal. . . . But Elizabeth could feel like a man an unselfish interest in a great cause; Mary Stuart was ever her own centre of hope, fear, or interest; she thought of nothing, cared for nothing, except as linked with the gratification of some ambition, some desire, some humour of her own; and thus Elizabeth was able to overcome temptations before which Mary fell.

The galley which bore Mary Stuart and her fortunes reached the Forth without accident, after an uneasy passage of four days. The English vessels saw their prey pass by and dared not stoop upon it. The Queen of Scotland landed on the pier of Leith on the morning of the 19th of August [1561].

Though her coming had been so long talked of, her appear-

ance took her people by surprise. They had made no preparation for her, and Holyrood Palace lay among its meadows, with the black precipices of Salisbury Crags frowning over it, like a deserted ruin.

But the Princess who was returning to make her home there was not to be made unhappy by small discomforts. She established herself amidst laughter and kind words in a few hurriedly-arranged rooms. The Puritan citizens serenaded her through her first night with psalm tunes, and she thanked them for their kindness.

The effect of her presence was marvellous. Her personal fascination revived the national loyalty, and swept all Scotland to her feet. Knox, the greatest and sternest of the Calvinistic preachers, alone withstood her spell. The rough Scotch nobles owned that there was in Mary "some enchantment whereby men are bewitched." A promise of religious toleration united her subjects as one man in support of the temperate claim which she advanced to be named Elizabeth's successor by Parliament.

Next to Mary in the line of succession stood Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, the son of the Countess of Lennox, the grandson of Margaret Tudor by her second marriage with the Earl of Angus. The Lennoxes had remained rigid Catholics. It was by a match with Henry Stuart that Mary determined to unite the forces of Catholicism. With wonderful subtlety she succeeded in dispelling Elizabeth's suspicions, while drawing the boy and his mother to her Court; and the threat of war with which the English queen strove too late to prevent the marriage only succeeded in hastening it.

The match was regarded on all sides as a challenge to Protestantism. Philip, who had till now regarded Mary's pretence of toleration and her hopes from France with equal suspicion, was at last warm in commending her cause. "She is the one gate," he owned, "through which Religion can be restored in England." The Lords of the Congregation woke with a start from their confidence in the Queen; and her half-brother, Lord James Stuart, better known later on as Earl of Murray, mustered his Protestant

confederates. But their revolt was hardly declared when Mary marched on them with pistols in her belt, and drove their leaders helplessly over the Border.

"With the help of God and of your Holiness," Mary wrote to the Pope, "I will leap over the wall." Rizzio still remained her adviser, and the daring advice he gave her fell in with her natural temper. She had resolved to restore Catholicism in Scotland. France offered her support. The English Catholics of the North prepared to revolt as soon as she was ready to aid them. No such danger had ever threatened Elizabeth as this, but everything hung on the will of a woman whose passions were even stronger than her will. Mary had staked all on her union with Darnley, and yet only a few months had passed since her wedding day [July 29, 1565] when men saw that she "hated the King." The boy turned out a dissolute, insolent husband; and Mary's scornful refusal of his claim of the "crown matrimonial," a refusal probably inspired by her Italian minister Rizzio, drove his jealousy to madness. At the very moment when the Queen revealed the extent of her schemes by the attainder of Murray and his adherents and by her dismissal of the English ambassador, the young King, followed by his kindred the Douglasses, burst into her chamber, dragged Rizzio from her presence, and stabbed him brutally on the stair-head. [March 9, 1566]. The darker features of Mary's character were now to develop themselves. Darnley, keen as was her thirst for vengeance on him, was needful as yet to her revenge on his abettors, and to the triumph of her political aims. She masked her hatred beneath a show of affection which severed the wretched boy from his fellow-conspirators; then, flinging herself into Dunbar, she marched in triumph on Edinburgh at the head of eight thousand men, while the Douglasses and the Protestant Lords who had shrunk from joining Murray fled to England or their strongholds. Her intrigues with the English Catholics she had never interrupted, and the Court was full of Papists from the northern counties. "Your actions," Elizabeth wrote in a sudden break of fierce candour, "are as full of venom as your words are

of honey." The birth of her child, [June 19, 1566] the future James the Sixth of Scotland and First of England, doubled Mary's strength. "Her friends were so increased," an ambassador wrote to her from England, "that many whole shires were ready to rebel, and their captains named by election of the nobility."

Scarcely was the child's sex made known, than Sir James Melville was in the saddle. The night of the 19th he slept at Berwick; on the evening of the 22d he rode into London. A grand party was going forward at Greenwich: the Queen was in full force and spirit, and the court in its summer splendour. A messenger glided through the crowd and spoke to Cecil; Cecil whispered to his mistress, and Elizabeth flung herself into a seat, dropped her head upon her hand, and exclaimed, "The Queen of Scots is the mother of a fair son, and I am but a barren stock." Bitter words!—how bitter those only knew who had watched her in the seven years' struggle between passion and duty.

The anxiety of the Parliament which met at this crisis proved that the danger was felt to be real. The Houses saw but one way of providing against it; and they renewed their appeal for Elizabeth's marriage, and for a settlement of the succession. . . . But Elizabeth stood alone in her resistance to them. Even Cecil's fears for "the religion" proved greater than his statesmanship; and he pressed for a Protestant successor. But the Queen stood firm. The promise to marry, which she gave after a furious burst of anger, she resolved to evade as she had evaded it before.

One terrible event suddenly struck light through the gathering clouds. Mary had used Darnley as a tool to effect the ruin of his confederates and to further her policy, but she had never forgiven him. The miserable boy was left to wander in disgrace and neglect from place to place; while Mary's purpose of vengeance was quickened by Darnley's complaints and intrigues, and yet more by her passion for the Earl of Bothwell, the boldest, as he was the most worthless, of the younger nobles. Ominous words dropped from her lips. "Unless she were freed of her husband some way," she said at last, "she had no pleasure to live." Rumours of

an approaching divorce were followed by darker whispers among the lords. The terrible secret of the deed which followed is still wrapt in a cloud of doubt and mystery, which will probably never be wholly dispelled; but taken simply by themselves the facts have a significance which it is impossible to explain away. The Queen's hatred to Darnley passed all at once into demonstrations of the old affection. He had fallen sick with vice and misery, and she visited him on his sick bed, and persuaded him to follow her to Edinburgh. She visited him again in a ruinous and lonely house without the walls, in which he was lodged by her order, kissed him as she bade him farewell, and rode gaily back to a wedding-dance at Holyrood. Two hours after midnight [Feb. 10, 1567] an awful explosion shook the city; and the burghers rushed out from the gates to find the house of Kirk O'Field destroyed, and Darnley's body dead beside the ruins, though "with no signs of fire on it." The murder was undoubtedly the deed of Bothwell. His servants, it was soon known, had stored the powder beneath the King's bed-chamber; and the Earl had watched without the walls till the deed was done. But, in spite of gathering suspicion, and of the charge of murder made formally against him by Lord Lennox, no serious steps were taken to investigate the crime; and a rumour that Mary purposed to marry the murderer drove her friends to despair. Her agent in England wrote to her that "if she married that man she would lose the favour of God, her own reputation, and the hearts of all England, Ireland, and Scotland." But every stronghold in the kingdom was soon placed in Bothwell's hands, and this step was the prelude to a trial and acquittal which the overwhelming force of his followers in Edinburgh turned into a bitter mockery. The Earl was married, but a shameless suit for divorce removed this last obstacle to his ambition; and his seizure of the Queen on her way from Linlithgow was followed by a marriage. They rode to Dunbar. In a month more all was over. The horror at such a marriage with a man fresh from her husband's blood drove the whole nation to revolt. Its nobles, Catholic as well as Protestant, gathered in arms at Stirling; and their entrance into Edin-

burgh roused the capital into insurrection. Mary and the Earl advanced with a fair force to Seton to encounter the Lords; but their men refused to fight, and Bothwell galloped off into life-long exile, while the Queen was brought back to Edinburgh in a frenzy of despair, tossing back wild words of defiance to the curses of the crowd. From Edinburgh she was carried a prisoner to the fortress of Lochleven; and her brother, the Earl of Murray, was recalled from France to accept the Regency of the realm. [August 22, 1567].

For the moment England was saved, but the ruin of Mary's hopes had not come one instant too soon. The great conflict between the two religions, which had begun in France, was slowly widening into a general struggle over the whole face of Europe. . . . At the moment when Mary entered Lochleven, the Duke of Alva was starting with a veteran army on his march to the Low Countries.

While the news of Alva's massacres stirred in every one of Elizabeth's Protestant subjects a thirst for revenge which it was hard to hold in check, yet to strike a blow at Alva was impossible, for Antwerp was the great mart of English trade, and its master had England's rising commerce in his power. A final stoppage of the trade with Flanders would have broken half the merchants in London. Every day was deepening the perplexities of Elizabeth, when Mary succeeded in making her escape from Lochleven.

Mary had abandoned all hope of Scotland; and changing her designs with the rapidity of genius, she pushed in a light boat across the Solway, and was safe before evening fell in the castle of Carlisle. The presence of Alva in Flanders was a far less peril than the presence of Mary in Carlisle.

Elizabeth was driven to temporize as before. She refused Cecil's counsels;¹⁹ but she sent money and arms to Condé, and hampered Alva by seizing treasure on its way to him, and by

¹⁹ Cecil, later Lord Burleigh, at the head of the Protestants, demanded a general alliance with the Protestant churches throughout Europe, a war in Flanders against Alva, and the unconditional surrender of Mary to her Scotch subjects for the punishment she deserved.

pushing the quarrel even to a temporary embargo on shipping either side of the sea.

Rome now did its best to stir the Catholics to activity by issuing a Bull of Excommunication and Deposition against Elizabeth, which was found nailed in a spirit of ironical defiance on the Bishop of London's door. (1570).

Mary, who had been foiled in new hopes of her restoration, by the refusal of the Scotch Lords to accept her, turned to the body of Conservative peers at whose head stood the Duke of Norfolk. His dreams of a marriage with Mary were detected by Cecil, and checked by a short sojourn in the Tower, but his correspondence with the Queen of Scots was renewed on his release, and ended in an appeal to Philip for the intervention of a Spanish army. At the head of this appeal stood the name of Mary; while Norfolk's name was followed by those of many lords of "the old blood" as the prouder peers styled themselves. Enough of these conspiracies was discovered to rouse a fresh ardor in the menaced Protestants. The Parliament met to pass an act of attainder against the northern Earls, and to declare the introduction of Papal Bulls into the country an act of high treason. The rising indignation against Mary was shown in a statute, which declared any person who laid claim to the Crown during the Queen's lifetime incapable of ever succeeding to it.

With Norfolk's death and that of Northumberland, who followed him to the scaffold, the dread of a revolt within the realm, which had so long hung over England, passed quietly away. The failure of the two attempts not only showed the weakness and disunion of the party of discontent and reaction, but it revealed the weakness of all party feeling before the rise of a national temper which was springing naturally out of the peace of Elizabeth's reign, and which a growing sense of danger to the order and prosperity around it was fast turning into a passionate loyalty to Elizabeth. It was not merely against Cecil's watchfulness or Elizabeth's cunning that Mary and Philip and the Percies dashed themselves in vain; it was against a new England.

England in Elizabeth's Time

Buried as she seemed in foreign negotiations and intrigues, Elizabeth was above all an English sovereign. She devoted herself ably and energetically to the task of civil administration.

Under Elizabeth, as under her predecessors, the terrible measures of repression, whose uselessness More had in vain pointed out, went pitilessly on: we find magistrates of Somersetshire capturing a gang of a hundred bandits at a stroke, hanging fifty at once on the gallows, and complaining bitterly to the Council of the necessity for waiting till the Assizes before they could enjoy the spectacle of the fifty others hanging beside them. But the issue of a Royal commission to enquire into the whole matter enabled the Queen [1562] to deal with the difficulty in a wiser and more effectual way. The principles embodied in these measures, the principle of local responsibility for local distress, and that of a distinction between the pauper and the vagabond, were more clearly defined in two statutes which marked the middle period of Elizabeth's reign. In 1572 houses of correction were ordered to be established for the punishment and amendment of the vagabond class by means of compulsory labor; in 1597, power to levy and assess a general rate in each parish for the relief of the poor was transferred from the justices to its churchwardens. The well-known Act [1601] which finally established this system, the 43d of Elizabeth, remained the basis of our system of pauper-administration until a time within the recollection of living men.

The entire cessation of the great social danger was owing, however, not merely to law, but to the natural growth of wealth and industry throughout the country. One acre under the new system produced, it was said, as much as two under the old. As a more careful and constant cultivation was introduced, a greater number of hands were required on every farm; and much of a surplus labor which had been flung off the land in the commencement of the new system was thus recalled to it. But a far more efficient agency in absorbing the unemployed was found in the development of manufactures. The linen trade was as yet of

small value, and that of silk-weaving was only just introduced. But the woollen manufacture had become an important element in the national wealth. England no longer sent her fleeces to be woven in Flanders and to be dyed at Florence. The spinning of yarn, the weaving, fulling, and dyeing of cloth, was spreading rapidly from the towns over the countryside. The farmers' wives began everywhere to spin their wool from their own sheep's backs into a coarse "home-spun." The South and the West still remained the great seats of industry and of wealth, the great homes of mining and manufacturing activity.

The growth, however, of English commerce far outstripped that of its manufactures. We must not judge of it, indeed, by any modern standard; for the whole population of the country can hardly have exceeded five or six millions, and all the vessels engaged in ordinary commerce were estimated at little more than fifty thousand tons. But it was under Elizabeth that English commerce began the rapid career of development which has made England the carrier of the world.

What Elizabeth really contributed to this commercial development was the peace and social order from which it sprang, and the thrift which spared the purses of her subjects by enabling her to content herself with the ordinary resources of the Crown. She lent, too, a ready patronage to the new commerce, she shared in its speculations, she considered its extension and protection as a part of public policy, and she sanctioned the formation of the great Merchant Companies which could then alone secure the trader against wrong or injustice in distant countries.

The disuse of salt-fish and the greater consumption of meat marked the improvement which was taking place among the agricultural classes. The rough and wattled farmhouses of the agricultural classes were being superseded by dwellings of brick and stone. Pewter was replacing the wooden trenchers of the earlier yeomanry; there were yeomen who could boast a fair show of silver plate. It is from this period, indeed, that we can first date the conception of domestic comfort. The chimney-corner

came into existence with the general introduction of chimneys, a feature rare in ordinary houses at the beginning of this reign. Pillows, which had before been despised were now in general use. Carpets superseded the filthy flooring of rushes. The lofty houses of the wealthier merchants marked the rise of a new middle and commercial class which was to play its part in later history. The prodigal use of glass became a marked feature in the domestic architecture of the time, and one whose influence on the general health of the people can hardly be over-estimated. Long lines of windows stretched over the fronts of the new manor halls. But the enjoyment of light and sunshine was a mark of the temper of the age. The lavishness of a new wealth united with a lavishness of life, a love of beauty, of color, of display, to revolutionize English dress. The Queen's three thousand robes were rivalled in their bravery by the slashed velvets, the ruffs, the jewelled purpoints of the courtiers around her. The strange medley of past and present which distinguishes its masques and feastings only reflected the medley of men's thoughts. Pedantry, novelty, the allegory of Italy, the chivalry of the Middle Ages, the mythology of Rome, the English bear-fight, pastorals, superstition, farce, all took their turn in the entertainment which Lord Leicester provided for the Queen at Kenilworth.²⁰

It was to this turmoil of men's minds, this wayward luxuriance and prodigality of fancy, that we owe the revival of English letters under Elizabeth.²¹

The wonderful growth in wealth and social energy which we have described was accompanied by a remarkable change in the religious temper of the nation. It was in the years which we are traversing that England became firmly Protestant. The quiet decay of the traditionary Catholicism which formed the religion of three-fourths of the people at Elizabeth's accession is shown by the steady diminution in the number of recusants throughout her

²⁰ See Sir Walter Scott's novel *Kenilworth*.

²¹ We can do no more than mention the names of Ascham, Sidney, Marlowe, Spenser, Bacon, Ben Jonson, and Shakespeare, the great writers who made the Elizabethan age the Augustan age of English literature.

reign; and at its close the only parts of England where the old faith retained anything of its former vigor were the north and extreme west, at that time the poorest and least populated parts of the kingdom.

Under the rule of Elizabeth, loyalty became more and more a passion among Englishmen; and the Bull of Deposition placed Rome in the forefront of Elizabeth's foes. The conspiracies which festered around Mary were laid to the Pope's charge; he was known to be pressing on France and on Spain the invasion and conquest of the heretic kingdom; he was soon to bless the Armada. Every day made it harder for a Catholic to reconcile Catholicism with loyalty to his Queen or devotion to his country. Whatever fire and energy was wanting to the new movement, was given at last by the atrocities which marked the Catholic triumph on the other side of the Channel. The horror of Alba's butcheries, or of the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day, revived the memories of the bloodshed under Mary. The tale of Protestant sufferings was told with a wonderful pathos and picturesqueness by John Foxe, an exile during the persecution; and his *Book of Martyrs* which had been set up by Royal order in the churches for public reading, passed from the churches to the shelves of every English household.

Persecution of Catholics

Dr. Allen, a scholar who had been driven from Oxford, had set up a seminary at Douay. The new college, liberally supported by the Catholic peers and supplied with pupils by a stream of refugees from Oxford, soon landed its "seminary priests" on English shores; and few as they were at first, their presence was at once felt in the check which it gave to the gradual reconciliation of the Catholic gentry to the English Church.

No check could have been more galling to Elizabeth, and her resentment was quickened by the sense of a fresh danger. She had accepted from the first the issue of the Bull of Deposition as a declaration of war on the part of Rome, and she viewed the Douay priests simply as political emissaries of the Papacy; and as Eliza-

both passed from indifference to suspicion, and from suspicion to terror, she no longer chose to restrain the bigotry around her. The queen's terror became, in fact, a panic in the nation at large. The few priests who landed from Douay were multiplied into an army of Papal emissaries, despatched to sow treason and revolt throughout the land. The Parliament, which had now through the working of the Test Act become a wholly Protestant body, save for the presence of a few Catholics among the peers, was summoned to meet the new danger, and declared the landing of the priests and the harboring of them to be treason. The Act proved no idle menace; and the execution of Cuthbert Mayne, a young priest who was arrested in Cornwall, gave a terrible indication of the character of the struggle upon which Elizabeth was about to enter. She shrank, indeed, from the charge of religious persecution; she boasted of her abstinence from any interference with men's consciences. She was a persecutor, but she was the first English ruler who felt the charge of religious persecution to be a stigma on her rule; the first who distinctly disclaimed religious differences as a ground for putting men to death. It is fair, too, to acknowledge that there was a real political danger in the new missionaries. However, the panic of the Protestants and of Parliament far outran the greatness of the danger. The death of Campian²² was the prelude to a steady, pitiless effort at the extermination of his class. If we adopt the Catholic estimate of the time, the twenty years which followed saw the execution of two hundred priests, while a yet greater number perished in the filthy and fever-stricken jails into which they were plunged. The work of reconciliation to Rome was arrested by this ruthless energy; but, on the other hand, the work which the priests had effected could not be undone. The system of quiet compulsion and conciliation to which Elizabeth had trusted for the religious reunion of her subjects was foiled; and the English Catholics, fined, imprisoned at every crisis of national danger, and deprived of their teachers by the prison

²² A leader of the Jesuits in England.

and the gibbet, were severed more hopelessly than ever from the National Church.

But the effect of this bloodshed on the world without, was far more violent, and productive of wider and greater results. The torture and death of the Jesuit martyrs sent a thrill of horror through the whole Catholic Church, and roused at last into action the sluggish hostility of Spain. Spain was at this moment the mightiest of European powers. The whole of this enormous power, too, was massed in the hands of a single man. Served as he was by able statesmen and subtle diplomatists, Philip of Spain was his own sole minister. His bigotry went hand in hand with his thirst for power. Italy and Spain lay hushed beneath the terror of the Inquisition. The shadow of this gigantic power fell like a deadly blight over Europe. The new Protestantism, like the spirit of political liberty, saw its real foe in Philip.

Meanwhile dangers thickened round Elizabeth in England itself. Maddened by persecution, the fiercer Catholics listened to schemes of assassination, to which the murder of William of Orange lent at the moment a terrible significance. The detection of a fanatic who had received the Host before setting out for London "to shoot the Queen with his dagger," was followed by measures of natural severity, by the flight and arrest of Catholic gentry and peers. The trial and death of Parry, a member of the House of Commons who had served in the Queen's household, on a similar charge, brought the Parliament together in a transport of horror and loyalty. All Jesuits and seminary priests were banished from the realm on pain of death. A bill for the security of the Queen disqualified any claimant of the succession, who instigated subjects to rebellion or hurt to the Queen's person, from ever succeeding to the Crown. The threat was aimed at Mary Stuart. Weary of her long restraint, of her failure to rouse Philip or Scotland to aid her, of the baffled revolt of the English Catholics and the baffled intrigues of the Jesuits, she bent for a moment to submission. "Let me go," she wrote to Elizabeth; "let me retire from this island to some solitude where I may prepare my soul to

die. Grant this and I will sign away every right which either I or mine can claim." But the cry was useless, and her despair found a new and more terrible hope in the plots against Elizabeth's life. She knew and approved the vow of Anthony Babington and a band of young Catholics, for the most part connected with the Royal household, to kill the Queen; but plot and approval alike passed through Walsingham's hands, and the seizure of Mary's correspondence revealed her guilt. In spite of her protests, a Commission of Peers sate as her judges at Fotheringay Castle; and their verdict of "guilty" annihilated under the provisions of the recent statute her claim to the Crown. The streets of London blazed with bonfires, and peals rang out from steeple to steeple at the news of her condemnation; but, in spite of the prayer of Parliament for her execution, and the pressure of the Council, Elizabeth shrank from her death. The force of public opinion, however, was now carrying all before it, and the unanimous demand of her people wrested at last a sullen consent from the Queen. She flung the warrant signed upon the floor, and the Council took on themselves the responsibility of executing it. Mary died on a scaffold which was erected in the castle-hall at Fotheringay, as dauntlessly as she had lived. "Do not weep," she said to her ladies, "I have given my word for you." "Tell my friends," she charged Melville, "that I die a good Catholic."

The blow was hardly struck before Elizabeth turned with fury on the ministers who had forced her hand. Burghley was for a while disgraced. Davison, who carried the warrant to the Council, was flung into the Tower to atone for an act which shattered the policy of the Queen. The death of Mary Stuart in fact removed the last obstacle out of Philip's way, by putting an end to the divisions of the English Catholics. To him, as to the nearest heir in blood who was of the Catholic faith, Mary bequeathed her rights to the Crown, and the hopes of her adherents were from that moment bound up in the success of Spain.

The Spanish Armada

On the twenty-ninth of July, 1588, the sails of the Armada were seen from the Lizard, and the English beacons flared out their alarm along the coast. The news found England ready. An army was mustering under Leicester at Tilbury, the militia of the midland counties were gathering to London, while those of the south and east were held in readiness to meet a descent on either shore. Had the Prince of Parma landed, he would have found his way to London barred by a force stronger than his own. Had he landed, his only chance of success lay in a Catholic rising; and at this crisis patriotism proved stronger than religious fanaticism in the hearts of the English Catholics. Catholic gentry brought their vessels up alongside of Drake and Lord Howard, and Catholic lords led their tenantry to the muster at Tilbury. But to secure a landing at all, the Spaniards had to be masters of the Channel, and in the Channel lay an English fleet resolved to struggle hard for the mastery. As the Armada sailed on in a broad crescent past Plymouth, moving towards its point of junction with Parma at Dunkirk, the vessels which had gathered under Lord Howard slipped out of the bay and hung with the wind upon their rear. The English fleet counted only 80 vessels against the 130 which composed the Armada. In size of ships the disproportion was even greater. Fifty of the English vessels were little bigger than yachts of the present day. Only four of the thirty Queen's ships equalled in tonnage the smallest of the Spanish galleons. Sixty-five of these galleons formed the most formidable half of the Spanish fleet; and four galleasses, or gigantic galleys, armed with 50 guns apiece, fifty-six armed merchantmen, and twenty pinnaces, made up the rest. The Armada was provided with 2500 cannons, and a vast store of provisions; it had on board 8000 seamen and 20,000 soldiers; and if a court-favourite, the Duke of Medina Sidonia, had been placed at its head, he was supported by the ablest staff of naval officers which Spain possessed. Small, however, as the English ships were, they were in perfect trim; they sailed two feet for the Spaniards' one, they were manned with 9000 hardy seamen,

and their Admiral was backed by a crowd of captains who had won fame in the Spanish seas. With him was Hawkins, who had been the first to break into the charmed circle of the Indies; Frobisher, the hero of the North-West passage; and above all Drake, who held command of the privateers. They had won too the advantage of the wind; and, closing in or drawing off as they would, the lightly-handled English vessels, which fired four shots to the Spaniards' one, hung boldly on the rear of the great fleet as it moved along the Channel. "The feathers of the Spaniard," in the phrase of the English seamen, were "plucked one by one." Galleon after galleon was sunk, boarded, driven on shore; and yet Medina Sidonia failed in bringing his pursuers to a close engagement. Now halting, now moving slowly on, the running fight between the two fleets lasted throughout the week, till the Armada dropped anchor in Calais roads. The time had now come for sharper work if the junction of the Armada with Parma was to be prevented; for, demoralized as the Spaniards had been by the merciless chase, their loss in ships had not been great, while the English supplies of food and ammunition were fast running out. Howard resolved to force an engagement: and, lighting eight fire-ships at midnight, sent them down with the tide upon the Spanish line. The galleons at once cut their cables, and stood out in panic to sea, drifting with the wind in a long line off Gravelines. Drake resolved at all costs to prevent their return. At dawn the English ships closed fairly in, and almost their last cartridge was spent ere the sun went down. Three great galleons had sunk, three had drifted helplessly on to the Flemish coast; but the bulk of the Spanish vessels remained, and even to Drake the fleet seemed "wonderful great and strong." Within the Armada itself however all hope was gone. Huddled together by the wind and the deadly English fire, their sails torn, their masts shot away, the crowded galleons had become mere slaughter-houses. A council of war resolved on retreat to Spain by the one course open, that of a circuit round the Orkneys. "Never anything pleased me better," wrote Drake, "than seeing the enemy fly with a southerly wind

to the northwards." But the work of destruction was reserved for a mightier foe than Drake. Supplies fell short and the English vessels were forced to give up the chase; but the Spanish ships which remained had no sooner reached the Orkneys than the storms of the northern seas broke on them with a fury before which all concert and union disappeared. Fifty reached Corunna, bearing ten thousand men stricken with pestilence and death; of the rest some were sunk, some dashed to pieces against the Irish cliffs.

The years which followed the defeat of the Armada were rich in events of profound national importance. They were years of splendor and triumph. The flag of England became supreme on the seas; English commerce penetrated to the farthest corners of the Old World, and English colonies rooted themselves on the shores of the New. The national intellect, strung by the excitement of sixty years, took shape in a literature which is an eternal possession to mankind.

The action before Gravelines of the 30th of July, 1588, decided the largest problems ever submitted in the history of mankind to the arbitrement of force. It broke the back of Spain. In its remoter consequences it determined the fate of the Reformation in Germany; for had Philip been victorious the League must have been immediately triumphant. It furnished James of Scotland with conclusive reasons for remaining a Protestant, and for eschewing forever the forbidden fruit of Popery; and thus it secured his tranquil accession to the throne of England when Elizabeth passed away.

Elizabeth's Last Days

Lonely as Elizabeth had always been, her loneliness deepened as she drew towards the grave. The statesmen and warriors of her earlier days had dropped one by one from her Council-board; and their successors were watching her last moments, and intriguing for favor in the coming reign. The temper of the age, in fact, was changing, and isolating her as it changed. She had

enjoyed life as the men of her day enjoyed it, and now that they were gone she clung to it with a fierce tenacity. She hunted, she danced, she jested with her young favorites, she coquetted and scolded and frolicked at sixty-seven as she had done at thirty. "The Queen," wrote a courtier a few months before her death, "was never so gallant these many years, nor so set upon jollity." But death crept on. Her face became haggard, and her frame shrank almost to a skeleton. At last her taste for finery disappeared, and she refused to change her dresses for a week together. A strange melancholy settled down upon her. If she once broke the silence, it was with a flash of her old queenliness. Cecil asserted that she "must" go to bed, and the word roused her like a trumpet. "Must!" she exclaimed; "is *must* a word to be addressed to princes? Little man, little man! thy father, if he had been alive, durst not have used that word." Then, as her anger spent itself, she sank into her old dejection. "Thou art so presumptuous," she said, "because thou knowest I shall die." She rallied once more when the ministers beside her bed named Lord Beauchamp, the heir to the Suffolk claim, as a possible successor. "I will have no rogue's son" she cried hoarsely, "in my seat." But she gave no sign, save a motion of the head at the mention of Mary Stuart's son, the King of Scots. Early the next morning, the life of Elizabeth, a life so great, so strange and lonely in its greatness, passed quietly away.

Of political wisdom, indeed, in its larger and more generous sense, Elizabeth had little or none; but her political tact was unerring. She seldom saw her course at a glance, but she played with a hundred courses, fitfully and discursively, as a musician runs his fingers over the keyboard, till she hit suddenly upon the right one. Her notion of statesmanship lay in watching how things turned out around her, and in seizing the moment for making the best of them.

The diplomatists who censured at one moment her irresolution, her delay, her changes of front, censured at the next her "obstinacy," her iron will, her defiance of what seemed to them

inevitable ruin. "This woman," Philip's envoy wrote after a wasted remonstrance,—“this woman is possessed by a hundred thousand devils.” To her own subjects, indeed, who knew nothing of her manoeuvres and retreats, of her “bye-ways” and “crooked ways,” she seemed the embodiment of dauntless resolution. Brave as they were, the men who swept the Spanish main or glided between the icebergs of Baffin's Bay never doubted that the palm of bravery lay with their Queen. Her steadiness and courage in the pursuit of her aims was equalled by the wisdom with which she chose the men to accomplish them. No sovereign ever gathered such a group of advisers as gathered around the council-board of Elizabeth.

If in loftiness of aim her temper fell below many of the tempers of her time, in the breadth of its range, in the universality of its sympathy it stood far above them all. Her finger was always on the public pulse. If Elizabeth could be said to love anything, she loved England; “Nothing,” she said to her first Parliament in words of unwonted fire, “nothing, no worldly thing under the sun, is so dear to me as the love and good-will of my subjects.” And the love and good-will which were so dear to her she fully won.

XXIII—ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS

James (VI of Scotland) I of England 1603-1625

No sovereign could have jarred against the conception of an English ruler which had grown up under the Tudors more utterly than James the First. His big head, his slobbering tongue, his quilted clothes, his rickety legs, his goggle eyes, stood out in as grotesque a contrast with all that men recalled of Henry or Elizabeth as his gabble, his want of personal dignity, his vulgar buffoonery, his coarseness, his pedantry, his contemptible cowardice. Under this ridiculous exterior however lay a man of much natural ability, a ripe scholar, with a considerable fund of shrewdness, of mother-wit, and ready repartee. His canny humor lights up the political and theological controversies of the time with quaint incisive phrases, with puns and epigrams and touches of irony, which still retain their savor. His reading, especially in theological matters, was extensive; and he was a voluminous author on subjects which ranged from predestinarianism to tobacco. But his shrewdness and learning only left him, in the phrase of Henry the Fourth of France, "the wisest fool in Christendom." All might have gone well had he confined himself to speculations about witchcraft, about predestination, about the noxiousness of smoking. Unhappily for England and for his successor, he clung yet more passionately to two theories which contained within them the seeds of a death-struggle between his people and the Crown. The first was that of a Divine right of Kings.

The King's "arrogant speeches," if they roused resentment in the Parliaments to which they were addressed, created by sheer force of repetition a certain belief in the arbitrary right they challenged for the Crown. We may give one instance of their tone from a speech delivered in the Star-Chamber. "As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do," said James, "so it is presumption and a high contempt in a subject to dispute what a King can do, or to say that a King cannot do this or that."

The claim was one which jarred against all that was noblest in the Puritan tone of the time. The temper of the Puritan was

eminently a temper of law. The diligence with which he searched the Scriptures sprang from his earnestness to discover a Divine Will which in all things, great and small, he might implicitly obey. But this implicit obedience was reserved for the Divine Will alone. It was plain that an impassable gulf parted such a temper as this from the temper of unquestioning devotion to the Crown which James demanded. But if the theory of a Divine right of Kings was certain to rouse against it all the nobler energies of Puritanism, there was something which roused its nobler and its pettier instincts of resistance alike in James's second theory of a Divine right of Bishops. Unbroken episcopal succession and hereditary regal succession were with the new sovereign the inviolable bases of Church and State. The two systems confirmed and supported each other. "No bishop, no King." ran the famous formula which embodied the King's theory.

It is only by thoroughly realizing the temper of the nation on religious and civil subjects, and the temper of the King, that we can understand the long Parliamentary conflict which occupied the whole of James's reign. The Parliament of 1604 met in another mood from that of any Parliament which had met for a hundred years. Short as had been the time since his accession, the temper of the King had already disclosed itself; and men were dwelling ominously on the claims of absolutism in Church and State which were constantly on the Royal lips. The claim of absolutism was met in words which sounded like a prelude to the Petition of Right. "Your Majesty would be misinformed," said their address, "if any man should deliver that the Kings of England have any absolute power in themselves either to alter religion, or to make any laws concerning the same, otherwise than as in temporal causes, by consent of Parliament."

The address was met by a petulant scolding from James; and the bishops, secure of the support of the Crown, replied by an act of bold defiance. The Cannons of 1604 compelled all curates to conform strictly to the prayer-book on pain of deprivation. In the following winter, three hundred of the Puritan clergy were

driven from their livings for non-compliance with these requirements. The only help came from an unlooked-for quarter.

James by his prodigality had already in a few years of peace doubled the debt which Elizabeth had left after fifteen years of war; and the course of illegal taxation on which he entered was far from supplying the deficit of the Exchequer. His first great constitutional innovation was the imposition of Customs duties on almost all kinds of merchandise imported or exported. But if the new duties came in fast, the Royal debt grew faster.

The Commons Remonstrate

Necessity forced on the King a fresh assembling of Parliament. He forbade the Commons to enter on the subject of the new duties, but their remonstrance was none the less vigorous. "Finding that your Majesty without advice or counsel of Parliament hath lately in time of peace set both greater impositions and more in number than any of your noble ancestors did ever in time of war," they prayed "that all impositions set without the assent of Parliament may be quite abolished and taken away," and that "a law be made to declare that all impositions set upon your people, their goods or merchandise, save only by common consent in Parliament, are and shall be void."

The Parliament was dissolved, and four years passed before the financial straits of the Government forced James to face the two Houses again. But the spirit of resistance was now fairly roused. Never had an election stirred so much popular passion as that of 1614. In every case where rejection was possible, the Court candidates were rejected. All the leading members of the Country party, or as we should call it now the Opposition, were again returned. But three hundred of the members were wholly new men; and among these we note for the first time the names of the great leaders in the later struggle with the Crown—John Pym, Thomas Wentworth, John Eliot. Signs of an unprecedented excitement were seen in the vehement cheering and hissing which for the first time marked the proceedings of the Commons. But

the policy of the Parliament was precisely the same as that of its predecessors. The Commons refused to grant supplies till grievances had been redressed, and fixed on that of illegal taxation as the first to be amended. Unluckily the inexperience of the bulk of the members led them into quarrelling on a point of privilege with the Lords; and the King, who had been frightened beyond his wont at the vehemence of their tone and language, seized on the quarrel as a pretext for their dissolution.

Four of the leading members in the dissolved Parliament were sent to the Tower; and the terror and resentment which it had roused in the King's mind were seen in the obstinacy with which he long persisted in governing without any Parliament at all. For seven years he carried out with a blind recklessness his theory of an absolute rule, unfettered by any scruples as to the past, or any dread of the future. All the abuses which Parliament after Parliament had denounced were not only continued, but developed in a spirit of defiance.

In his distress for money James was driven to expedients which widened the breach between the gentry and the Crown. He had refused to part with the feudal privileges which had come down to him from the Middle Ages, such as his right to the wardship of young heirs and the marriage of heiresses, and these were now recklessly used as a means of fiscal extortion. He degraded the nobility by a shameless sale of peerages. Of the ninety lay peers whom he left in the Upper House at his death, a large part had been created by sheer bargaining during his reign. By shifts such as these James put off from day to day the necessity for again encountering the one body which could permanently arrest his effort after despotic rule.

The lawyers had been subservient beyond all other classes to the Crown. But beyond precedents even the judges refused to go. James sent for them to the Royal closet, and rated them like school-boys, till they fell on their knees, and, with a single exception, pledged themselves to obey his will. The Chief-Justice, Sir Edward Coke, a narrow-minded and bitter-tempered man, but of the

highest eminence as a lawyer, and with a reverence for the law that over-rode every other instinct, alone remained firm. When any case came before him, he answered, he would act as it became a judge to act. Coke, who had at once been dismissed from the Council, was on the continuance of his resistance deprived of his post of Chief-Justice. No act of James seems to have stirred a deeper horror and resentment among Englishmen than this announcement of his will to tamper with the course of justice. It was an outrage on the growing sense of law, as the profusion and profligacy of the Court were an outrage on the growing sense of morality.

The Treasury was drained to furnish masques and revels on a scale of unexampled splendor. Lands and jewels were lavished on young adventurers, whose fair faces caught the Royal fancy. Actors in the royal masques were seen rolling intoxicated in open Court at the King's feet. A scandalous trial showed great nobles and officers of state in league with cheats and astrologers and poisoners. James himself meddled with justice to obtain a shameful divorce for Lady Essex, the most profligate woman of her time; and her subsequent bridal with one of his favorites was celebrated in his presence. Before scenes such as these, the half-idolatrous reverence with which the sovereign had been regarded throughout the period of the Tudors died away into abhorrence and contempt. The players openly mocked at the King on the stage.

But the immorality of James's Court was hardly more despicable than the imbecility of his government. After the death of Lord Burleigh's son Robert Cecil, all real control over affairs was withdrawn by James from the Council, and entrusted to worthless favorites whom the King chose to raise to honor. A Scotch page named Carr was created Earl of Rochester, married after her divorce to Lady Essex, and only hurled from favor and power by the discovery of his murder of Sir Thomas Overbury by poison. But the shame of one favorite only hurried James into the choice of another; and George Villiers, a handsome young adventurer,

was raised rapidly through every rank of the peerage, made Marquis and Duke of Buckingham, and entrusted with the direction of English policy. The payment of bribes to him, or marriage with his greedy relatives, soon became the only road to political preferment. Resistance to his will was inevitably followed by dismissal from office. Even the highest and most powerful of the nobility were made to tremble at the nod of this young upstart. But the selfishness and recklessness of Buckingham were equal to his beauty; and the haughty young favorite was destined to drag down in his fatal career the throne of the Stuarts.

The stately reserve, the personal dignity and decency of manners which distinguished the heir to the throne, Prince Charles, contrasted favorably with the gabble and indecorum of his father. The courtiers indeed who saw him in his youth, would often pray God that "he might be in the right way when set; for if he was in the wrong he would prove the most wilful of any king that ever reigned." The marriage of Charles with Henrietta, a daughter of Henry the Fourth of France, and sister of its King, promised a renewal of the system of Elizabeth. At this juncture the death of James I, placed Charles upon the throne; and his first Parliament met him in a passion of loyalty. "We can hope everything from the King who now governs us," cried Sir Benjamin Rudyard in the Commons.

Charles the First 1625-1649

But Charles renewed the toleration of the Catholics, and warned the House to leave priest and recusant to the discretion of the Crown. It was soon plain that his ecclesiastical policy would be even more hostile to the Puritans than that of his father had been. Bishop Laud was put practically at the head of ecclesiastical affairs, and Laud had at once drawn up a list of ministers divided ominously into "orthodox" and "Puritan."

But there were other grounds for their distrust besides the King's ecclesiastical tendency. The subsidy of the last Parliament had been wasted, yet Charles still refused to declare with what

power England was at war, or to avow that the great fleet he was manning was destined to act against Spain. His reserve therefore was met by a corresponding caution. While voting a subsidy, the Commons restricted their grant of certain Customs duties, which had commonly been granted to the new sovereign for life, to a single year. The restriction was taken as an insult; Charles refused to accept the grant, and Buckingham resolved to break with the Parliament at any cost.

If Hampden and Pym are the great figures which embody the later national resistance, the earlier struggle for Parliamentary liberty centres in the figure of Sir John Eliot. He fixed, from the very outset of his career, on the responsibility of the royal ministers to Parliament, as the one critical point for English liberty. He persisted in denouncing Buckingham's incompetence and corruption, and the Commons ordered the subsidy which the Crown had demanded, to be brought in "when we shall have presented our grievances, and received his Majesty's answer thereto." Charles summoned them to Whitehall, and commanded them to cancel the condition. He would grant them "liberty of counsel, but not of control"; and he closed the interview with a significant threat. "Remember," he said, "that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting, and dissolution: and therefore as I find the fruits of them to be good or evil, they are to continue or not to be." But the will of the Commons was as resolute as the will of the King. Buckingham's impeachment was voted and carried to the Lords. The favorite took his seat as a peer to listen to the charge with so insolent an air of contempt, that one of the managers appointed by the Commons to conduct it, turned sharply on him. "Do you jeer, my Lord!" said Sir Dudley Digges. "I can show you when a greater man than your Lordship—as high as you in place and power, and as deep in the King's favor—has been hanged for as small a crime as these articles contain." The "proud carriage" of the Duke provoked an invective from Eliot which marks a new era in Parliamentary speech. The frivolous ostentation of Buckingham, his very figure blazing with jewels

and gold, gave point to the fierce attack. "He has broken those nerves and sinews of our land, the stores and treasures of the King. There needs no search for it. It is too visible. His profuse expenses, his superfluous feasts, his magnificent buildings, his riots, his excesses, what are they but the visible evidences of his waste of the revenues of the Crown?" With the same terrible directness Eliot reviewed the Duke's greed and corruption, his insatiate ambition, his seizure of all public authority, his neglect of every public duty, his abuse for selfish ends of the powers he had accumulated. "The pleasure of his Majesty, his known directions, his public acts, his acts of council, the decrees of courts—all must be made inferior to this man's will. No right, no interest may withstand him. Through the power of state and justice he has dared ever to strike at his own ends."

The reply of Charles was as fierce and sudden as the attack of Eliot. He hurried to the House of Peers to avow as his own the deeds with which Buckingham was charged. Eliot and Digges were called from their seats, and committed prisoners to the Tower. The Commons, however, refused to proceed with public business till their members were restored; and after a ten days' struggle Eliot was released. But his release was only a prelude to the close of Parliament. "Not one moment," the King replied to the prayer of his Council for delay; and the final remonstrance in which the Commons begged him to dismiss Buckingham from his service forever was met by their instant dissolution. The remonstrance was burnt by Royal order, Eliot was deprived of his Vice-Admiralty and the subsidies which Parliament had refused to grant till their grievances were redressed were levied in the arbitrary form of benevolences. But the tide of public resistance was slowly rising. Refusals to give anything, "save by way of Parliament," came in from county after county. The arguments of the judges, were met by the crowd with a tumultuous shout of "a Parliament! a Parliament! else no subsidies!" In the country at large, resistance was universal. The northern counties in a mass set the Crown at defiance. Eight peers, with Lord Essex and Lord

Warwick at their head, declined to comply with the exaction as illegal. Two hundred country gentlemen were summoned before the Council. John Hampden, as yet only a young Buckinghamshire squire, appeared at the board to begin that career of patriotism which has made his name dear to Englishmen. "I could be content to lend," he said, "but fear to draw on myself that curse in Magna Carta, which should be read twice a year against those who infringe it." So close an imprisonment in the Gate House rewarded his protest, "that he never afterwards did look like the same man as before."

The Petition of Right, 1628

Charles, overwhelmed as he was with debt and shame, was forced to summon a new Parliament; a Parliament which met in a mood even more resolute than the last. The Court candidates were everywhere rejected. The patriot leaders were triumphantly returned. To have suffered in the recent resistance to arbitrary taxation was the sure road to a seat. Heedless of sharp and menacing messages from the King, of demands that they should take his "Royal word" for their liberties, the House bent itself to one great work, the drawing up a Petition of Right. The statutes that protected the subject against arbitrary taxation, against loans and benevolences, against punishment, outlawry, or deprivation of goods, otherwise than by lawful judgment of his peers, against arbitrary imprisonment without stated charge, against billeting of soldiery on the people or enactment of martial law in time of peace, were formally recited. The breaches of them under the last two sovereigns, and above all since the dissolution of the last Parliament, were recited as formally. At the close of this significant list, the Commons prayed "that no man hereafter be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge without common consent by Act of Parliament...."

It was in vain that the Lords desired to conciliate Charles by a reservation of his "sovereign power." "Our petition," Pym quietly replied, "is for the laws of England, and this power seems

to be another power distinct from the power of the law." The Lords yielded, but Charles gave an evasive reply; and the failure of the more moderate counsels for which his own had been set aside, called Eliot again to the front. In a speech of unprecedented boldness he moved the presentation to the King of a Remonstrance on the state of the realm. But at the moment when he again touched on Buckingham's removal as the preliminary of any real improvement the Speaker of the House interposed. "There was a command laid on him," he said, "to interrupt any that should go about to lay an aspersion on the King's ministers." The breach of their privilege of free speech produced a scene in the Commons such as had never been witnessed before. Eliot sat down abruptly amidst the solemn silence of the House. "Then appeared such a spectacle of passions," says a letter of the time, "as the like had seldom been seen in such an assembly: some weeping, some expostulating, some prophecying of the fatal ruin of our kingdom. . . . There were above an hundred weeping eyes, many who offered to speak being interrupted and silenced by their own passions." Pym himself rose only to sit down choked with tears. At last Sir Edward Coke found words to blame himself for the timid counsels which had checked Eliot at the beginning of the Session, and to protest "that the author and source of all those miseries was the Duke of Buckingham."

Shouts of assent greeted the resolution to insert the Duke's name in their Remonstrance. But the danger to his favorite²³ overcame the King's obstinacy, and to avert it he suddenly offered to consent to the Petition of Right. His consent won a grant of subsidy from the Parliament, and ringing of bells and lighting of bonfires from the people. But like all Charles's concessions, it came too late to effect the end at which he aimed. The Commons persisted in presenting their Remonstrance.

But whatever national hopes the fall of Buckingham had aroused were quickly dispelled, Weston, a creature of the Duke, became Lord Treasurer, and his system remained unchanged.

²³ A soldier in the army soon assassinated Buckingham.

It seemed as if no act of Charles could widen the breach which his reckless lawlessness had made between himself and his subjects. But there was one thing dearer to England than free speech in Parliament, than security for property, or even personal liberty; and that one thing was, in the phrase of the day, "the Gospel." Charles raised Laud to the bishopric of London and entrusted him with the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. Laud promised a speedy increase in the numbers and the power of the Romanists.

The Parliament of 1629

When the House met, the first business it called up was that of religion. The Commons avowed that they held for truth that sense of the Articles as established by Parliament, which by the public act of the Church had been delivered unto them. But the debates over religion were suddenly interrupted. The Speaker signified that he had received a Royal order to adjourn. Dissolution was clearly at hand, and the long-suppressed indignation broke out in a scene of strange disorder. The Speaker was held down in the chair, while Eliot denounced the new Treasurer as the adviser of the measure. "None have gone about to break Parliaments," he added in words to which after events gave a terrible significance, "but in the end Parliaments have broken them." The doors were locked, and in spite of the Speaker's protests, of the repeated knocking of the usher sent by Charles to summon the Commons to his presence in the Lords' chamber, and of the gathering tumult within the House itself, the loud "Aye, Aye" of the bulk of the members supported Eliot in his last vindication of English liberty. By successive resolutions the Commons declared whosoever should bring in innovations in religion, or whatever minister advised the levy of subsidies not granted in Parliament, "a capital enemy to the Kingdom and Commonwealth," and every subject voluntarily complying with illegal acts and demands "a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy of the same."

The dissolution of the Parliament of 1629 marked the darkest

hour of Protestantism, whether in England or in the world at large. But it was in this hour of despair that the Puritans won their noblest triumph. It was during the years of tyranny which followed the close of the third Parliament of Charles that the great Puritan emigration founded the States of New England.

William Laud

During the next two years, as the sudden terror which had found so violent an outlet in Eliot's warnings died for the moment away there was a lull in the emigration. But the measures of Laud soon revived the panic of the Puritans. Cold, pedantic, ridiculous, superstitious, as he was, William Laud rose out of the mass of court-prelates by his industry, his personal unselfishness, his remarkable capacity for administration. His real influence was derived from the unity of his purpose. He directed all the power of a clear, narrow mind, and a dogged will, to the realization of a single aim. His resolve was to raise the Church of England to what he conceived to be its real position as a branch, though a reformed branch, of the great Catholic Church throughout the world. The freedom of worship therefore which had been allowed to the Huguenot refugees from France, or the Walloons from Flanders, was suddenly withdrawn; and the requirement of conformity with the Anglican ritual drove them in crowds from the southern ports to seek toleration in Holland. The great obstacle in his way was the Puritanism of nine-tenths of the English people, and on Puritanism he made war without mercy. Rectors and vicars were scolded, suspended, deprived for "Gospel preaching." The use of the surplice, and the ceremonies most offensive to Puritan feeling, were enforced in every parish.

The Tyranny 1629-1640

At the opening of his Third Parliament, 1629, Charles had hinted in ominous words that the continuance of Parliament at all depended on its compliance with his will. No Parliament met for eleven years. The leaders of the country party in the last Parlia-

ment were thrown into prison; and Eliot died, the first martyr of English liberty, in the Tower.

It was curious to see to what shifts the Royal pride was driven in its effort at once to fill the Exchequer. Vexatious measures of extortion were far less hurtful to the State than the conversion of justice into a means of supplying the Royal necessities by means of the Star Chamber.

The Star Chamber

Its scope extended to every misdemeanor; and the Court was at liberty to adjudge any punishment short of death. The possession of such a weapon would have been fatal to liberty under a great tyrant; under Charles it was turned simply to the profit of the Exchequer. Nothing, indeed, better marks the character of Charles than his conduct as to the Petition of Right. He had given his assent to it, he was fond of bidding Parliament rely on his "Royal word," but the thought of his pledge seems never to have troubled him for an instant. From the moment he began his career of governing without a Parliament every one of the abuses he had promised to abolish, such as illegal imprisonment, or tampering with the judges, was resorted to as a matter of course. His penury, in spite of the financial expedients we have described, drove him inevitably on to the fatal rock of illegal taxation. The exaction of Customs duties went on as of old at the ports. Writs were issued for the levy of "benevolences" from the shires. The resistance of the London merchants was roughly put down by the Star Chamber. Chambers, an alderman of London, who complained bitterly that men were worse off in England than in Turkey, was ruined by a fine of two thousand pounds, and died broken-hearted in prison.

*Laud and Strafford*²⁴

The financial pressure was seized by Laud and Strafford to force the King on to a bolder course. All pretence of precedents

²⁴ Special topic "The Earl of Strafford"

was thrown aside, and Laud resolved to find a permanent revenue in the conversion of the "ship-money" levied on ports and the maritime counties into a general tax imposed by the Royal will upon the whole country. The sum expected from the tax was no less than a quarter of a million pounds a year.

But there were men who saw the danger to freedom in this levy of ship-money. John Hampden, a friend of Eliot's, a man of consummate ability, of unequalled power of persuasion, of a keen intelligence, ripe learning, and a character singularly pure and loveable, had already shown the firmness of his temper in his refusal to contribute to the forced loan of 1626. He now repeated his refusal, declared ship-money an illegal impost, and resolved to rouse the spirit of the country by an appeal for protection to the law.

The news of Hampden's resistance thrilled through England. For twelve days the cause of ship-money was solemnly argued before the full bench of Judges. It was proved that the tax in past times had been levied only in cases of sudden emergency, and confined to the coast and port towns alone, and that even the show of legality had been taken from it by formal Statute and by the Petition of Right. In the following spring the judges in England delivered at last their long-delayed decision on Hampden's case. All save two laid down the broad principle that no Statute prohibiting arbitrary taxation could be pleaded against the King's will. But Hampden's work had been done. His resistance had roused England to a sense of the danger to her freedom, and forced into light the real character of the Royal claims.

The King's demand for immediate submission, which reached Edinburgh with the significant comment of the Hampden judgment, at once gathered the whole body of remonstrants together; and a protestation, read at Edinburgh, was followed by the renewal of the Covenant with God which had been drawn up and sworn to in a previous hour of peril, when Mary was still plotting against Protestantism, and Spain was preparing its Armada. "We promise and swear," ran the solemn engagement at its close,

"by the great name of the Lord our God, to continue in the profession and obedience of the said Religion, and that we shall defend the same, and resist all their contrary errors and corruptions, according to our vocation and the utmost of that power which God has put into our hands all the days of our life." The Covenant was signed in the churchyard of the Grey Friars at Edinburgh, in a tumult of enthusiasm, "with such content and joy as those who, having long before been outlaws and rebels, are admitted again into covenant with God."

In 1640 Charles summoned what from its brief duration is known as the Short Parliament. The Houses met in a mood which gave hopes of an accommodation with the Crown. But the Commons declared as of old that redress of grievances must precede the grant of supplies. Even an offer to relinquish ship-money failed to draw Parliament from its resolve, and after three weeks' sitting it was roughly dissolved. "Things must go worse before they go better" was the cool comment of St. John, one of the patriot leaders.

The Long Parliament 1640-1644

The threat of a Scotch advance forced Charles at last to give way and drove him to summon the Houses once more to Westminster.

If Strafford embodied the spirit of tyranny, John Pym, the leader of the Commons stands out for all time as the embodiment of law. Of the band of patriots with whom he had stood side by side in the constitutional struggle against the earlier despotism of Charles he was the sole survivor. He had shown he knew how to wait, and when waiting was over he showed he knew how to act. He saw that as an element of constitutional life Parliament was of higher value than the Crown; he saw, too, that in Parliament itself the one essential part was the House of Commons. He displayed from the first meeting of the Long Parliament the qualities of a great administrator, an immense faculty for labor, a genius for organization, patience, tact, a power of inspiring con-

fidence in all whom he touched, calmness and moderation under good fortune or ill, an immovable courage, an iron will. No English ruler has ever shown greater nobleness of natural temper or a wider capacity for government than the Somersetshire squire whom his enemies greeted truly enough as "King Pym."

The resolute looks of the members as they gathered at Westminster contrasted with the hesitating words of the King, and each brought from borough or county a petition of grievances. One by one the illegal acts of the Tyranny were annulled. The civil and criminal jurisdiction of the Privy Council, the Star Chamber, the court of High Commission and a crowd of lesser tribunals were summarily abolished. Ship-money was declared illegal, and the judgment in Hampden's case annulled. A statute declaring "the ancient right of the subjects of this kingdom that no subsidy, custom, import, or any charge whatsoever, ought or may be laid or imposed upon any merchandize exported or imported by subjects, denizens, or aliens, without common consent in Parliament," put an end for ever to all pretensions to a right of arbitrary taxation on the part of the Crown. A Triennial Bill enforced the assembly of the Houses every three years and bound the returning officers to proceed to election if the Royal writ failed to summon them. Charles protested, but gave way.

Great as were the changes which had been wrought in the first six months of the Long Parliament, they had been based strictly on precedent, and had, in fact, been simply a restoration of the older English constitution as it existed at the close of the Wars of the Roses.

Charles regarded his consent to the new measures as having been extorted by force, and to be retracted at the first opportunity. Both Houses in their terror, swore to defend the Protestant religion and the public liberties. Pym resolved to appeal for aid to the nation itself. The Solemn Remonstrance which he laid before the House was a detailed narrative of the work which the Parliament had done, the difficulties it had surmounted and the new dangers which lay in its path.

The new King's party fought fiercely, debate followed debate, the sittings were prolonged till, for the first time in the history of the House, lights had to be brought in; and it was only at midnight, and by a majority of eleven, that the Remonstrance was finally adopted, after a scene of unexampled violence. The Remonstrance was felt on both sides to be a crisis in the struggle. "Had it been rejected," said Cromwell, as he left the House, "I would have sold tomorrow all I possess, and left England forever. Listened to sullenly by the King, it kindled afresh the spirit of the country: London swore to live and die with the Parliament, and associations were formed in every county for the defence of the Houses. The brawls of the two parties, who gave each other the nicknames of "Round-heads" and "Cavaliers" created fresh alarm in the Parliament but Charles persisted in refusing it a guard.

[We omit the details of the civil war in England in 1644 to 1645 between the King's party or Cavaliers and the Puritans or Roundheads. The battles of Marston Moor, 1644, and Naseby, 1645 (in both of which Cromwell's "Ironsides"²⁵ won) gave the victory to the Puritans. A struggle then followed between the Army and Parliament.]

The two great parties which have ever since divided the social, the political, and the religious life of England, whether as Independents and Presbyterians, as Whigs and Tories, or as Conservatives and Liberals, sprang into organized existence in the contest between the Army and the Parliament.

Petitions from the regiments at once demanded "justice on the King." A fresh "Remonstrance" from the Council of Officers called for the election of a new Parliament; for electoral reform;

²⁵ The regiment of a thousand men which Cromwell raised for the Association of the Eastern Counties, and which soon became known as his Ironsides was formed strictly of "men of religion." He spent his fortune freely on the task he set himself. "The business. . . . hath had of me in money between eleven and twelve hundred pounds, therefore my private estate can do little to help the public. . . . I have little money of my own left to help my soldiers." But they were "a lovely company," he tells his friends with soldierly pride. No blasphemy, drinking, disorder, or impiety were suffered in their ranks. "Not a man swears but he pays his twelve pence." Quoted from Green's text.

for the recognition of the supremacy of Parliament "in all things," and demanded above all "that the capital and grand author of our troubles, by whose commissions, commands and procurements, and in whose behalf and for whose interest only, of will and power, all our wars and troubles have been, with all the miseries attending them, may be specially brought to justice for the treason, blood and mischief he is therein guilty of."

Charles the First is executed 1649

Charles was seized by a troop of horse and carried off to Hurst Castle; while a letter from Fairfax announced the march of his army upon London. "We shall know now," said Vane, as the troops took their post round the Houses of Parliament, "who is on the side of the King, and who on the side of the people. But the terror of the army proved weaker among their members than the agonized loyalty which strove to save Charles, and an immense majority in both Houses still voted for the acceptance of the terms he had offered. The next morning saw Colonel Pride at the door of the House of Commons with a list of forty members of the majority in his hands. The Council of Officers had resolved to exclude them, and as each member made his appearance he was arrested, and put in confinement. "By what right do you act?" a member asked. "By the right of the sword," Hugh Peters is said to have replied. The House was still resolute, but on the following morning forty more members were excluded, and the rest gave way. The formal expulsion of one hundred and forty members left the Independents, who alone remained, free to co-operate with the army which had delivered them; the removal of Charles to Windsor was followed by an instant resolution for his trial, and by the nomination of a Court of one hundred and fifty Commissioners to conduct it, with John Bradshaw, a lawyer of eminence at their head. The rejection of this Ordinance by the few peers who remained, brought about a fresh resolution from the Lower House, "that the People are, under God, the original of all just power; that the Commons of England in Parliament assembled—

being chosen by, and representing, the people—have the supreme power in this nation; and that whatsoever is enacted and declared for law by the Commons in Parliament assembled hath the force of a law, and all the people of this nation are concluded thereby, although the consent and concurrence of the King or House of Peers be not had thereunto.”

Charles appeared before the Court only to deny its competence and to refuse to plead; but thirty-two witnesses were examined to satisfy the consciences of his judges, and it was not till the fifth day of the trial that he was condemned to death as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and enemy of his country. The popular excitement had vented itself in cries of “Justice,” or “God save your Majesty,” as the trial went on, but all save the loud outcries of the soldiers was hushed as Charles passed to receive his doom. The dignity which he had failed to preserve in his long jangling with Bradshaw and the judges returned at the call of death. Whatever had been the faults and follies of his life, “he nothing common did, or mean, upon that memorable scene.” Two masked executioners awaited the King as he mounted the scaffold, which had been erected outside one of the windows of the Banqueting House at Whitehall; the streets and roofs were thronged with spectators; and a strong body of soldiers stood drawn up beneath. His head fell at the first blow, and as the executioner lifted it to the sight of all a groan of pity and horror burst from the silent crowd.

The Commonwealth

The news of the King's death was received throughout Europe with a thrill of horror. The Czar of Russia chased the English envoy from his court. The ambassador of France was withdrawn on the proclamation of the Republic. The Protestant powers of the Continent seemed more anxious than any to disavow all connection with the Protestant people who had brought a King to the block. Holland took the lead in acts of open hostility to the new power as soon as the news of the execution reached the Hague; the States-General waited solemnly on the Prince of Wales, who took

the title of Charles the Second, and recognized him as "Majesty," while they refused an audience to the English envoys. Their Stadtholder, his brother-in-law, the Prince of Orange, was supported by popular sympathy in the aid and encouragement he afforded to Charles.

The danger, however, was far greater nearer home. The Scots proclaimed Charles the Second as their King on the news of his father's death, and at once despatched an embassy to the Hague to invite him to ascend the throne.

A yet more formidable peril lay in the selfishness of the Parliament itself. It was now a mere fragment of the House of Commons; the members of the Rump—as it was contemptuously called—numbered hardly a hundred, and of those the average attendance was little more than fifty. In reducing it by "Pride's Purge" to the mere shadow of a House the army had never dreamt of its continuance as a permanent assembly. But the House insisted on the retention of its power. Not only were the existing members to continue as members of the New Parliament, depriving the places they represented of their right of choosing representatives, but they were to determine the validity of each election and the fitness of the members returned.

"It is contrary to common honesty," Cromwell angrily broke out; and quitting Whitehall, he summoned a company of musketeers to follow him as far as the door of the Commons. He sat down quietly in his place, "clad in plain grey clothes and grey worsted stockings." "I am come to do what grieves me to the heart," he said to his neighbor, but he still remained quiet. At length he rose and his tone grew higher as he exclaimed, "Your hour is come, the Lord hath done with you!" A crowd of members started to their feet in angry protest. "Come, come," replied Cromwell, "we have had enough of this;" and striding into the midst of the chamber, he clapt his hat on his head, and exclaimed, "I will put an end to your prating!" In the din that followed, his voice was heard in broken sentences—"It is not fit that you should sit here any longer! You should give place to better men! You are no

Parliament." Thirty musketeers entered at a sign from their General, and the fifty members present crowded to the door. The Speaker refused to quit his seat, till Harrison offered to "lend him a hand to come down." Cromwell lifted the mace from the table. "What shall we do with this bauble?" he said. "Take it away!" The door of the house was locked at last, and the dispersion of the Parliament was followed a few hours after by that of its executive committee, the Council of State. Cromwell himself summoned them to withdraw.

The dispersion both of Parliament and of its executive commission left England without a government. Cromwell, in fact, as Captain-General of the forces, found himself solely responsible for the maintenance of public order. But no thought of military despotism can be fairly traced in the acts of the general or the army. It was only when no other means existed that the soldiers had driven out the wrongdoers. "It is you that have forced me to this," Cromwell exclaimed, as he drove the members from the House; "I have sought the Lord night and day that He would rather slay me than put me upon the doing of this work."

The resignation of their powers by Cromwell and the Council into the hands of the Constituent Convention left it the one supreme authority. The Convention put the largest construction on its commission, and boldly undertook the whole task of constitutional reform. Committees were appointed to consider the needs of the Church and the nation. The spirit of economy and honesty which pervaded the assembly appeared in its redress of the extravagance which prevailed in the civil service, and of the inequality of taxation.

[Dissensions, however, made the Convention finally resign. The Council of State, named by the Convention, now drew up a Constitution, "and the dread of disorder" drove them "to complete their work by pressing the office of "Protector" upon Cromwell.]

Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector 1653-1658

The powers of the new Protector indeed were strictly limited. Though the members of the Council were originally named by

him, each member was irremovable save by consent of the rest; their advice was necessary in all foreign affairs, their consent in matters of peace and war, their approval in nominations to the great offices of state, or the disposal of the military or civil power. With this body too lay the choice of all future Protectors. To the administrative check of the Council was added the political check of the Parliament. Three years at the most were to elapse between the assembling of one Parliament and another.

Few Parliaments have ever been more memorable, or more truly representative of the English people, than the Parliament of 1654. It was the first Parliament in English history where members from Scotland and Ireland sat side by side with those from England, as they sit in the Parliament of today. They proceeded at once to settle the government on a Parliamentary basis. That Cromwell should retain his rule as Protector was unanimously agreed.²⁶

With the dissolution of the Parliament of 1654 ended all show of legal rule. The Protectorate, deprived by its own act of all chance of legal sanction, became a simple tyranny.

If pardon, indeed, could ever be won for a tyranny, the wisdom and grandeur with which he used the power he had usurped would win pardon for the Protector. The greatest among the many great enterprises undertaken by the Long Parliament had been the Union of the three Kingdoms.

No part of his policy is more characteristic of Cromwell's mind, whether in its strength or in its weakness, than his management of foreign affairs. While England had been absorbed in her long and obstinate struggle for freedom the whole face of the world around her had changed. But of the change in the world around him Cromwell seems to have discerned nothing.

Yet the errors of his foreign policy were small in comparison with the errors of his policy at home. The government of the Protector had become a simple tyranny, but it was impossible

²⁶ Special topic on: Why Cromwell finally dissolved this Parliament?

for him to remain content with the position of a tyrant. He was as anxious as ever to give a legal basis to his administration; and he seized on the war with Spain as a pretext for again summoning a Parliament. But he no longer trusted, as in the Parliament of 1654, to perfect freedom of election. The sixty members sent from Ireland and Scotland were simply nominees of the Government. Its whole influence was exerted to secure the return of the more conspicuous members of the Council. One of its earliest acts provided securities for Cromwell's person, which was threatened by constant plots of assassination.

It was no mere pedantry, still less was it vulgar flattery, which influenced the Parliament in their offer to Cromwell of the title of King. The experience of the last few years had taught the nation the value of the traditional forms under which its liberties had grown up. A king was limited by constitutional precedents. A Protector, on the other hand, was new in history, and there was no traditional means of limiting his power. Cromwell refused the Crown. "I cannot undertake this Government," he said, "with that title of King; and that is my answer to this great and weighty business."

But the hand of death was falling on the Protector. He had long been weary of his task. "God knows," he burst out a little time before to the Parliament, "I would have been glad to have lived under my woodside, and to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than to have undertaken this government." And now to the weariness of power was added the weakness and feverish impatience of disease.

A storm which tore roofs from houses, and levelled huge trees in every forest, seemed a fitting prelude to the passing away of his mighty spirit.

So absolute even in death was his sway over the minds of men, that, to the wonder of the excited Royalists, even a doubtful nomination on his death-bed was enough to secure the peaceful succession of his son, Richard Cromwell.

The new Protector was a weak and worthless man, but the

bulk of the nation were content to be ruled by one who was at any rate no soldier, no Puritan, and no innovator. Richard was known to be lax and godless in his conduct, and he was believed to be conservative and even Royalist in heart. The tide of reaction was felt even in his council. Their first act was to throw aside one of the greatest of Cromwell's reforms, and to fall back in the summons which they issued for the new Parliament on the old system of election. A new hope indeed filled men's minds. Not only was the nation sick of military rule, but the army, unconquerable so long as it held together, at last showed signs of division.

The Restoration, Charles the Second, 1660-1685

The Declaration of Breda, in which Charles promised a general pardon, religious toleration, and satisfaction to the army, was received with a burst of national enthusiasm; and the old Constitution was restored by a solemn vote of the Convention, "that according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this Kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by King, Lords, and Commons." The vote was hardly passed when Charles landed at Dover, and made his way amidst the shouts of a great multitude to Whitehall. "It is my own fault," laughed the new King, with characteristic irony, "that I had not come back sooner; for I find nobody who does not tell me he has always longed for my return."

No event ever marked a deeper or more lasting change in the temper of the English people than the entry of Charles the Second into Whitehall. With it modern England begins. Influences which had up to this time molded our history, the theological influence of the Reformation, the monarchical influence of the new Kingship, the feudal influence of the Middle Ages, the yet earlier influence of tradition and custom, suddenly lost power over the minds of men.

The Restoration brought Charles to Whitehall: and in an instant the whole face of England was changed. All that was noblest and best in Puritanism was whirled away with its pettiness and its tyranny in the current of the nation's hate. Religion had

been turned into a political and social tyranny, and it fell with their fall. Godliness became a by-word of scorn; sobriety in dress, in speech, in manners was flouted as a mark of the detested Puritanism. Duelling and raking became the marks of a fine gentleman; and grave divines winked at the follies of "honest fellows," who fought, gambled, swore, drank, and ended a day of debauchery by a night in the gutter. The life of a man of fashion vibrated between frivolity and excess.

It is easy, however, to exaggerate the extent of this reaction. So far as we can judge from the memoirs of the time, its more violent forms were practically confined to the capital and the Court. The mass of Englishmen were satisfied with getting back their may-poles and mince-pies; and a large part of the people remained Puritan in life and belief, though they threw aside many of the outer characteristics of Puritanism.

The pursuit of Physical Science became a passion; and its method of research, by observation, comparison, and experiment, transformed the older methods of inquiry in matters without its pale. In religion, in politics, in the study of man and of nature, not faith but reason, not tradition but inquiry, were to be the watchwords of the coming time. The dead-weight of the past was suddenly rolled away, and the new England heard at last and understood the call of Francis Bacon.

The age was one in which knowledge, as we have seen, was passing to fields of inquiry which had till then been unknown, in which Kepler and Galileo were creating modern astronomy, in which Descartes was revealing the laws of motion, and Harvey the circulation of the blood.

It is only by a survey of the larger tendencies of English thought that we can understand the course of English history in the years which followed the Restoration. When Charles the Second entered Whitehall, the work of the Long Parliament seemed undone. Not only was the Monarchy restored, but it was restored without restriction or condition; and of the two great influences which had hitherto served as checks on its power, the

first, that of Puritanism, had become hateful to the nation at large, while the second, the tradition of constitutional liberty, was discredited by the issue of the Civil War. But amidst all the tumult of demonstrative loyalty the great "revolution of the seventeenth century," as it has justly been styled, went steadily on. The supreme power was gradually transferred from the Crown to the House of Commons. The first acts of the new government showed a sense that, loyal as was the temper of the nation, its loyalty was by no means the blind devotion of the Cavalier.

In spite of a proclamation he had issued in the first days of his return, in which mercy was virtually promised to all the judges of the late King who surrendered themselves to justice, Charles pressed for revenge on those whom he regarded as his father's murderers, and the Lords went hotly with the King. It is to the credit of the Commons that they steadily resisted the cry for blood.²⁷

The fatal strife with Holland which had been closed by the wisdom of Cromwell was renewed. The quarrel of the Dutch and English merchants on the Guinea coast, where both sought a monopoly of the trade in gold-dust and slaves, was fanned by the ambition of the Duke of York and by the resentment of Charles himself at the insults he had suffered from Holland in his exile, into a war. A third battle ended in the triumph of the English, and their fleet sailed along the coast of Holland, burning ships and towns.

But the thought of the triumph was soon forgotten in the terrible calamities which fell on the capital. In six months a hundred thousand Londoners died of the plague which broke out in its crowded streets; and the plague was followed by a fire, which beginning near Fish street reduced the whole city to ashes from the Tower to the Temple.

The thunder of the Dutch guns woke England to a bitter sense of its degradation. The dream of loyalty was over. "Every-

²⁷ Special topic: The Regicide Judges. Parts of Evelyn's Diary and that of Pepys will be found interesting.

body now-a-days," Pepys tells us, "reflect upon Oliver and commend him, what brave things he did, and made all the neighbor princes fear him."

What his subjects saw in their King was a pleasant, brown-faced gentleman playing with his spaniels, or drawing caricatures of his ministers, or flinging cakes to the water-fowl in the park. The business-like Pepys soon discovered that "the King do mind nothing but pleasures, and hates the very sight or thoughts of business." His humor indeed never forsook him: even on his death-bed he turned to the weeping courtiers around him and whispered an apology for having been so unconscionable a time in dying. When his brother, the most unpopular man in England, solemnly warned him of the plots against his life, Charles laughingly bid him set all fear aside. "They will never kill me, James," he said, "to make you king." But courage and wit and ability seemed to have been bestowed on him in vain. Charles hated business. He gave no sign of ambition. The one thing he seemed in earnest about was sensual pleasure, and he took his pleasure with a cynical shamelessness which roused the disgust even of his shameless courtiers. Gambling and drinking helped to fill up the vacant moments when he could no longer toy with his favorites or bet at Newmarket. Virtue he regarded simply as a trick by which clever hypocrites imposed upon fools. He was incapable of love or of hate. The only feeling he retained for his fellow-men was that of an amused contempt.

It was difficult for Englishmen to believe that any real danger to liberty could come from an idler and a voluptuary such as Charles the Second. But in the very difficulty of believing this lay half the King's strength. He had in fact no taste whatever for the despotism of the Stuarts who had gone before him. His shrewdness laughed his grandfather's theories of Divine Right down the wind. His indolence made such a personal administration as that which his father delighted in, burdensome to him; he was too humorous a man to care for the pomp and show of power, and too good-natured a man to play the tyrant. He had no settled

plan of tyranny, but he meant to rule as independently as he could, and from the beginning to the end of his reign there never was a moment when he was not doing something to carry out his aim. But he carried it out in a tentative, irregular fashion which it was as hard to detect as to meet.

While cautious to avoid rousing popular resistance, he moved coolly and resolutely forward on the path of despotism. His death saved English freedom.

James the Second 1685-1688

The first words of James on his accession in February 1685 were a pledge to preserve the laws inviolate, and to protect the Church. The pledge was welcomed by the whole country with enthusiasm. All the suspicions of a Catholic sovereign seemed to have disappeared. "We have the word of a King!" ran the general cry, "and of a King who was never worse than his word." The conviction of his brother's faithlessness stood James in good stead. He was looked upon as narrow, impetuous, stubborn, and despotic in heart, but even his enemies did not accuse him of being false. Above all he was believed to be keenly alive to the honor of his country, and resolute to free it from foreign dependence.

Never had England shown a firmer loyalty; but its loyalty was changed into horror by the terrible measures of repression which followed on the victory of Sedgemoor.²⁸ Even North, the Lord Keeper, a servile tool of the Crown, protested against the license and bloodshed in which the troops were suffered to indulge after the battle. His protest, however was disregarded, and he withdrew broken-hearted from the Court to die. James was, in fact, resolved on a far more terrible vengeance; and the Chief-justice Jeffreys, a man of great natural powers but of violent temper, was sent to earn the Seals by a series of judicial murders which have left his name a byword for cruelty. Three hundred and fifty rebels were hanged in the "Bloody Circuit" as Jeffreys

²⁸ The English victory over the young claimant to the throne, the Duke of Monmouth.

made his way through Dorset and Somerset. More than eight hundred were sold into slavery beyond the sea. A yet larger number were whipped and imprisoned. The Queen, the maids of honor, the courtiers, even the Judge himself, made shameless profit from the sale of pardons. What roused pity above all were the cruelties wreaked upon women. Some were scourged from market town to market-town. Mrs. Lisle, the wife of one of the Regicides, was sent to the block at Winchester for harboring a rebel. Elizabeth Gaunt, for the same act of womanly charity was burned at Tyburn. Pity turned into horror when it was found that cruelty such as this was avowed and sanctioned by the King. But it was soon plain that the terror which the butchery was meant to strike into the people was part of a larger purpose.

While Englishmen were quivering with horror at the news from France,²⁹ James in defiance of the law was filling his new army with Catholic officers. Loyal as was the temper of the Houses, their alarm at Popery and at a standing army was yet stronger than their loyalty. The Commons by the majority of a single vote deferred the grant of supplies till grievances were redressed, and demanded in their address the recall of the illegal commissions.

The quick growth of discontent at these acts would have startled a wiser man into prudence, but James prided himself on the reckless violence of his procedure. Meanwhile James had begun in England a bold and systematic attack upon the Church. He regarded his ecclesiastical supremacy as a weapon providentially left to him for undoing the work which it had enabled his predecessors to do. Under Henry and Elizabeth it had been used to turn the Church of England from Catholic to Protestant. Under James it should be used to turn it back again from Protestant to Catholic.

The work James was doing in the Church he was doing with as mad a recklessness in the State. Parliament, which had been kept silent by prorogation after prorogation, was finally dissolved; and the King was left without a check in his defiance of the law.

²⁹ The persecutions which followed Louis the Fourteenth's revocation in 1685 of the Edict of Nantes.

The most devoted loyalists began to murmur when James demanded apostasy as a proof of their loyalty. He had soon in fact to abandon all hope of bringing the Church or the Tories over to his will.

The wiser among English statesmen had fixed their hopes steadily on the succession of Mary, the elder daughter and heiress of James. The tyranny of her father's reign made this succession the hope of the people at large. But to Europe the importance of the change, whenever it should come about, lay not so much in the succession of Mary, as in the new power which such an event would give to her husband, William, Prince of Orange. We have come in fact to a moment when the struggle of England against the aggression of its King, blends with the larger struggle of Europe against the aggression of Louis the Fourteenth.

General as the disaffection undoubtedly was, the position of James seemed to be secure. It was still therefore the aim of William to discourage all violent counsels. But at this moment the whole course of William's policy was changed by an unforeseen event. His own patience and that of the nation rested on the certainty of Mary's succession; for James was without a son. But in the midst of the King's struggle with the Church it was announced that the Queen, Mary of Modena, a Catholic, had born a son. Whatever lingering hesitation remained was swept away by the trial of the Bishops³⁰ and the birth of a Prince of Wales. The invitation to William to intervene in arms for the restoration of English liberty and the protection of the Protestant religion was

³⁰ On April 27, 1688 James had issued a new Declaration of Indulgence (which allowed Catholics to fill any office) and he ordered every clergyman to read it during divine service on two successive Sundays. Nearly all of the country clergy refused to obey the Royal orders. The Bishops went with the rest of the clergy. So threatening was the temper of the nation that his ministers pressed James to give way. But his obstinacy grew with the danger. "Indulgence," he said, "ruined my father;" and on June 29, the Bishops appeared as criminals at the bar of the King's Bench. The jury had been packed, the judges were mere tools of the Crown, but judges and jury alike were overawed by the indignation of the people at large. No sooner had the foreman of the jury uttered the words "Not guilty" than a roar of applause burst from the crowd, and horsemen spurred along every road to carry over the country the news of the acquittal." Green's text.

sent from London on the very day of the Acquittal. The general excitement, the shouts of the boats which covered the river, the bonfires, in every street, showed indeed that the country was on the eve of revolt. The army itself, on which James had implicitly relied, suddenly showed its sympathy with the people. James was at Hounslow when the news of the Acquittal reached him, and as he rode from the camp he heard a great shout behind him. "What is that?" he asked. "It is nothing," was the reply, "only the soldiers are glad that the Bishops are acquitted!" "Do you call that nothing?" grumbled the King. The shout told him that he stood utterly alone in his realm. The peerage, the gentry, the bishops, the clergy, the Universities, every lawyer, every trader, every farmer, stood aloof from him. His very soldiers forsook him. The most devoted Catholics pressed him to give way. But to give way was to reverse every act he had done since his accession, and to change the whole nature of his government. All show of legal rule had disappeared. Sheriffs, mayors, magistrates, appointed by the Crown in defiance of a parliamentary statute, were no real officers in the eye of the law. James had brought things to such a pass that the restoration of legal government meant the absolute reversal of every act he had done. But he was in no mood to reverse his acts. His temper was only spurred to a more dogged obstinacy by danger and remonstrance.

What prevented revolt was the general resolve to wait for the appearance of the Prince of Orange. William was gathering forces and transports with wonderful rapidity and secrecy, while noble after noble made their way to the Hague.

Detained by ill winds, beaten back on its first venture by a violent storm, William's fleet of six hundred transports, escorted by fifty men-of-war, anchored on the fifth of November in Torbay; and his army, thirteen thousand men strong, entered Exeter amidst the shouts of its citizens. Peers and gentry flocked to his standard. Everywhere the revolt was triumphant. The Royal army fell back in disorder. Its very leaders were secretly pledged to William, and the desertion of Lord Churchill was followed by

that of so many other officers that James abandoned the struggle in despair. He fled to London. Parliament, he said to the few who still clung to him, would force on him concessions he could not endure; and he only waited for news of the escape of his wife and child to make his way to the Isle of Sheppey, where a hoy³¹ lay ready to carry him to France. Some rough fishermen, who took him for a Jesuit, prevented his escape, and a troop of Life Guards brought him back in safety to London; but it was the policy of William and his advisers to further a flight which removed their chief difficulty out of the way. It would have been hard to depose James had he remained, and perilous to keep him a prisoner; but the entry of the Dutch troops into London, the silence of the Prince, and an order to leave St. James' filled the King with fresh terrors, and taking advantage of the means of escape which were almost openly placed at his disposal, James a second time quitted London and embarked on the 23d of December unhindered for France.

³¹ A small vessel. a sloop.

XXIV—WILLIAM AND MARY 1688-1702—THE BLOODLESS REVOLUTION

It was agreed that William and Mary should be acknowledged as joint sovereigns, but that the actual administration should rest with William alone. Somers, a young lawyer who had just distinguished himself in the trial of the Bishops, and who was destined to play a great part in later history, drew up a Declaration of Rights which was presented on February 13th to William and Mary by the two Houses in the banqueting room at Whitehall.

It recited the misgovernment of James, his abdication, and the resolve of the Lords and Commons to assert the ancient rights and liberties of English subjects.

It denied the right of any king to exercise a dispensing power, or to exact money or to maintain an army save by free consent of Parliament.

It asserted for the subject a right to petition, to a free choice of representatives in Parliament, and a pure and merciful administration of justice.

It declared the right of both Houses to liberty of debate. In full faith that these principles would be accepted and maintained by William and Mary, it ended with declaring the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen of England.

At the close of the Declaration, Halifax, in the name of the Estates of the Realm, prayed them to receive the crown. William accepted the offer in his own name and his wife's, and declared in a few words the resolve of both to maintain the laws and to govern by advice of Parliament.

INDEX

- Abraham, 34, 35, 217
 Abu Simbel, 15
 Abydos, 14, 15
 Accad, 28, 43
 Achaemenids, The, 69
 Act of Supremacy, 416-417
Adoni, 32
 Adrianople, 195
 Aegeans, 72-75
 Aegina, 101, 105, 110, 111
 Aegospotami, 121, 122, 124
 Aeneas, 147
 Aeschines, 137, 138
 Aeschylus, 91, 112
 Aethelberht, 243, 244, 245
 Aetius, 199
 Agincourt, 274
 Ahura-mazda, 65, 66
 Aidan, 246
 Aix-la-Chapelle, 229
 Akhnaton (Amenothos IV), 12, 13, 43
 Alaric the Goth, 196-199
 Albertus Magnus, 285
 Albigenes, The, 362, 378
 Albuquerque, 306
 Alchemy, 286-287
 Alcibiades (Alkibiades) 118-122
 Alcuin, 231, 232, 283
 Alexander the Great, 16, 63, 104, 138-145, 182, 185
 Alexander of Hales, 285
 Alexandria, 143, 179, 287
 Alfred the Great, 249, 255
 Alphabet, Phoenician, 41-42
 Alsace-Lorraine, 406
 Alva, Duke of, 389, 391, 392-394, 442, 447
 Amenothos I, 9
 Amenothos III, 12, 14
 Amenothos IV (Akhnaton, or Khûniatonu), 12, 13, 43
 Amon, 5, 13
 Amphiktyonies, 77-78, 100
 Amphipolis, 94, 117, 140
 Amusements, Roman, 167-168
Anabasis, The, quoted, 126-128
 Angevins, The, 262
 Angles, 240, 241, 242, 243, 253
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, The, 249, 257
 Anjou, Count of, 256, 258, 259
 Anjou, Duke of, 363, 369, 373
 Antipater, 138
 Antonines, The, 192
 Antonius, Marcus, 187
 Antwerp, 305, 388, 389, 390, 392, 395, 396, 442
 Appian Way, 199
 Arabia, 144, 145, 214
 Arabs, 214, 225, 219, 226, 228
 Archons, 81
 Areopagus, Senate of, 81
 Aristides, 94, 108
 Aristotle, 112, 138, 139
 Armada, The Spanish, 447, 451-453, 469
 Armenia, 69
 Artemisium, 97, 98, 100
 Aryans, 62, 63
 Asia, 10, 30, 41, 52, 67, 69, 92, 115, 142, 143, 172, 281, 297
 Asia Minor, 43, 44, 45, 70, 72, 86, 126, 172, 207, 211
 Asoka, 63
 Assuan, 2
 Assur, 46
 Assurbanipal, 52-54, 56
 Assyria, 16, 37, 46-55, 56, 64
 Astrology, 286-287
 Athenian empire, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 122, 123
 Athens, 80, 81, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 100, 101, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 132, 133, 134, 136, 138, 139
 Athos, Mount, 87, 88, 93
 Atonu, (the sun), 12, 13
 Attila, the Hun, 199
 Atwood, Dr., quoted, iv
 Augsburg, 305, 341; 353-355
 Augsburg, Peace of, 355, 396, 397
 Augustine, 244, 245
 Augustus Caesar, 187, 188, 206
 Austin (Augustine) Friars, 337, 342
 Austrasia, 225
 Austria, 377, 397, 398, 399, 401
 Avesta, The, 65
 Avignon, 333, 339, 362, 407

Baahm, 32
 Babylon, 37, 42, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 64, 67, 68, 70, 126, 142, 144

- Babylonia, 17-29, 30, 54, 55, 59
 Babylonia, Later (Chaldea) 56-58
 Bacon, Sir Francis, 480
 Bacon, Roger, 285-286
 Balboa, 307
 Ball, John, 272
 Barrack-room Emperors, 192
 Basques, 228
 Bavian, 5
 Becket, Thomas a., 258
 Bede, 246-247
 Bedouins, 214
 Behistun, 22, 68
 Belisarius, 204
 Benedictines, 213, 246
 Berghen, Marquis of, 386
 Bethlehem, 36, 206
 Bible, 37, 38, 347-348; 409-411
 Black Death, The, 271-272
 Blood, Council of, 393
 Boccaccio, 316, 320
 Boethius, 201, 202, 203, 319
 Boghaz-Keui, 44, 45
 Bohemia, 377, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401
 Bohemian Royal Charter, 397
 Boleyn, Anne, 414, 415, 417, 419, 420, 426, 429
 Bologna, 318, 319, 322
Book of Martyrs, 447
 Books, lack of, 318-321
 Borak, The, 218
 Bothwell, Earl of, 435, 440, 441, 442
 Brazil, 306
 Breasted, Dr. James Henry, referred to, 2, 34, 37, 44, 45
 Bremen, 305
 Bretigny, Treaty of, 271
 Britain, 188, 238-250
 British Museum, 263, 305
 Brittany (Bretons) 262, 312
 Bruce, Robert, 269
 Bruges, 305
 Brunelleschi, 327, 329
 Brussels, 380, 392
 Brutus, 186, 187
 Bryce, James, quoted, 205
 Buckingham, Lord (George Villiers) 460, 461, 462, 463, 465
 Buddha, 63
 Bulgaria, 293, 294, 295
 Bull, Papal, 335, 343, 344, 345, 415, 443, 447
 Burma, 62
 Byblos, 38, 39, 41
 Byzantium, 128, 193
 Cabot (Gabote) John 311
 Cabot (Gabote) Sebastian, 311, 312, 313
 Cabral, Alvarez, 306
 Caedmon, 246
 Caesar, Julius, 177-186; 221, 238
 Cairo, 3
 Calais, 271, 276, 431
 Caligula, 188
 Calvin, John, 356-361; 432
 Camoens, 306
 Campania, 146
 Campian (Edmund Campion) 448
 Canaanites, 35
 Cannae, 157, 174
 Canterbury, 244
 Capet, Hugh, 233
 Carchemish, 10, 32
 Carmelites, 213
 Carolingians (or Carlovingians) 225, 233
 Cartagena, 157
 Carthage, 120, 144, 151, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 172, 287
 Carthaginians, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 172
 Cartier, 307, 311, 312
 Cassiodorus, 201, 202
 Cassius, 186, 187
 Catacombs, 211
 Catherine of Aragon, 413, 414, 415, 417, 420, 421, 433
Catholic League, 397, 398, 400, 402, 453
 Catiline, 177, 180
 Cato, Marcus Porcius, 148, 158, 164, 166, 173-174, 202
 Cavaliers, 472
 Caxton, 322
 Caxton's *Mirror of the World*, 278-281
 Cecil, Lord Burleigh (or Burghley) 440, 442, 443, 450, 454, 460
 Cecil, Robert, 460
 Celts, 221, 222, 225, 238
 Cervantes, 237
 Chalons, 199, 221
 Chaldea (Later Babylonia) 16, 37, 55, 56-58; 66, 67, 86
 Champollion, 2
 Charlemagne, 225, 226-232; 233, 235, 283, 287, 335

- Charles I, of England, 461-474
 Charles II, of England, 475, 479-483
 Charles V, Emperor, 333, 334, 345-346;
 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 377, 378,
 406, 414, 415, 424, 425, 426, 431
 Charles IX, of France, 362, 364, 365,
 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373,
 374, 375
 Charles Martel, 225
 Charter, The Great (Magna Carta) 263-
 264
 Chaucer, 255, 339, 408
 Cheops (Kheops) 8, 9
 Cheronaca, 138, 139
 Chersonese, 135, 136, 137
 China, Ancient, 59-61; 193, 321
 Chivalry, 235-237, 270
 Christ, 206, 217
 Christian IV, of Denmark, 400, 402
 Christianity, 206-213; 220, 222, 224,
 225, 238, 242, 243-246; 297, 314, 333
 Christians, 188, 189, 193, 215, 287, 288,
 289, 290, 292
 Chronology, 20, 30, 77, 206, 212, 216
 Church and State, Struggle between,
 333
 Chrysoloras, 313
 Cicero, 133, 177
 City-states, Greek, 80-81
 Civilization, Early, 4
 Claudius, Appian, 150
 Claudius, Tiberius, 188
 Cleisthenes (Kleisthenes) 84-85
 Cleopatra, 16, 187
 Clermont, Council of, 290, 291
 Clotilde, 222-224
 Clovis, 2 1-224, 225
 Cnossos (Knossos) 74
 Code of Hammurabi (Khammurabi)
 28-29
 Coke, Sir Edward, 459, 460, 465
 Colet, John, 413
 Coligny, Admiral, 359, 363, 364, 367,
 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 374, 394
 Cologne, 305
 Colossae, 126
 Colosseum, The, 189-190
 Colossi, The, 12
 Columba, 246
 Columbus, Christopher, 302, 306-307
 Commerce, 24, 25, 39-40; 43, 149, 154;
 170-171; 253, 271, 305, 306, 307, 308,
 442, 444, 445
 Commons, The, 267, 269, 418, 424, 449,
 458, 459, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466,
 470, 473, 474, 481, 484
 Commonwealth, The, 474-479
 Compagnacci, 330
 Condé, Prince de (Louis I de Bourbon)
 359, 363, 364, 435, 442
 Confederacy of Delos, 107-110, 112
 Confucius, 60, 61
 Constance, 339, 411
 Constantine, 193, 212
 Constantinople, 193, 196, 199, 200, 203,
 204, 220, 293, 313, 320
 Copernicus, 324, 325
 Corinth, Congress at, 95
 Cornelia, 174
 Cornwell, John, 255
 Cortés, Fernando, 307
 Council, The Great, (of England) 265,
 266, 267, 268
 Covenant, The Scotch, 469, 470
 Cranmer, Thomas, 417, 419, 427, 428,
 429, 430
 Cressy, (Crécy) 270
 Crete, 42, 73, 74, 80, 172, 207
 Croesus, of Lydia, 67, 83, 86
 Cromlechs, 33
 Cromwell, Oliver, 181, 472, 475, 476-
 478; 479
 Cromwell, Richard, 478, 479
 Crusades, 260, 287-302
 Cuneiform Writing, 17, 18, 21, 22, 41,
 43, 68
 Cuthbert, 246
 Cyrus, 37, 66, 67, 69
 Da Gama, Vasco, 306
 Damascus, 32
 Danes, The, 247-249; 250, 253
 Dante, 315, 316, 320
 Danube, 139, 140, 141, 182, 194, 200
 Darius, King of Persia, 67-71, 86, 87,
 88, 92
 Datis, 88, 89, 91, 95
 David, King, 36, 37
 Davis, William Stearns, 177, 355
 Deccan, The, 62
 Dekarchies, 124, 125
 Delos, 107, 111, 112, 172
 Delos, Confederacy of, 107-110
 Delphic Oracle, 77, 78, 79, 95, 99, 142

- Delta, The, 1, 2, 3, 5
 Demades, 138, 140
 Demosthenes, 134, 135-138; 139, 419
 Denmark, 247, 396
 Descartes, 480
 Diaz, Bartolomeo, 306
 Diocletian, 193, 211, 212
 Diogenes, 142
 Discoveries, 305-313
 Divine Right of Kings, 456, 457, 482
 Dodona, 78
 Domesday Book, 252
 Dominicans, 213, 302, 328, 329, 348
 Domitian, 189, 192, 210
 Donatello, 328
Don Quixote, 237
 Douay priests, 447, 448, 449
 Double, The Egyptian, 57
 Draco, 81
 Drake, Sir Francis, 451, 452, 453
 Druidism, 238
 Ducat, 319
 Duns Scotus, 285
 Duruy, Victor (quoted) 220; 235-237;
 284-287; 305-308
 Dynasty, 8

 Eadwine, 244-245
 Eastern Roman Empire, 203-215
 Ecbatana, 64, 66, 68
 Eck, Johann von, 342, 343
 Edinburgh, 245
 Edward I, of England, 267-269
 Edward II, of England, 269-270
 Edward III, of England, 269, 270-273
 Edward IV, of England, 276, 412, 413
 Edward V, of England, 276
 Edward VI, of England, 359, 419, 420-
 421; 433
 Edward the Confessor, 249, 250, 251,
 263
 Egbert, 247, 248, 255
 Eginhard, 228, 229, 231, 232
 Egmont, Count of, 386, 387, 388, 393
 Egypt, 1-16; 18, 25, 30, 34, 39, 43, 44,
 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 67, 70, 86, 92, 115,
 143, 170, 187, 288
 Eliot, Sir John, 458, 462, 463, 465, 466,
 467, 468, 469
 Elizabethan literature, 446
 Elizabeth Tudor, 381, 419, 420, 422,
 423, 424, 425, 426, 428, 429, 431,
 432-455; 456, 458, 484

 Emerton, Ephraim (quoted) 224
 England, The Reformation in, 407, 411,
 416, 417, 420, 421
 English language, 253-255
 Epaminondas, 132-133
 Ephialtes, the traitor, 98
 Erasmus, 356, 379-380; 413, 414
 Eretria, 87, 88, 89
 Erfurt, University of, 337, 338
 Eridu, 18
 Esarhaddon, 51-53
 Este family, 314, 319, 326
 Ethiopia, 115, 144
 Etruria (Tuscany) 146
 Etruscans, 78, 144, 146, 147, 149
 Euboea, 88, 114
 Euphrates, 17, 32, 34, 43, 57, 182
 Euripides, 112, 125
 Evans, Sir Arthur, 73
 Exchequer, 256, 259, 458, 468

 Fabius, Quintus, Cunctator, 157
 Ferdinand, I, Emperor, 377, 400, 401,
 402
 Ferdinand of Styria, Ferdinand II, 397,
 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 404, 406
 Ferrara, 314, 326, 327
 Feudalism, 233-237; 252, 270, 272, 297,
 412
 Fiefs, 233, 234
 Fires, The great fire at Rome, 188, 190
 The great fire in London, 481
 Fisher, George Park (quoted) 206-213
 Flavians, 189
 Florence, 313, 316, 317, 318, 322, 327,
 328, 329, 330, 445
 Florin, 319
 Forty-two Articles, 421
 Forum, 147, 168
 Fotheringay Castle, 450
 Foxe, John, 447
 France, 221, 222, 224, 233, 234, 249,
 292, 362-377
 Francis I, of France, 353, 362, 396
 Francis II, of France, 362, 363, 364, 435
 Francis, Saint, 213
 Franciscans, 285, 302, 328, 407
 Fra Angelico, 328
 Franks, The, 221, 222, 223, 224
 Fredegarius, 222, 223
 Frederic the Wise, 337, 338, 340, 341,
 342, 344, 346, 354

- Frederic the Winter King of Bohemia, 398
 Frederick I, Barbarossa (of Germany) 296, 333
 Free cities, Rise of, 302-305
 Freeman, Edward A., 146, quoted: 186-188; 253-255
 French League, 376
 Frenchmen, racial characteristics, 225
 Frisians, 241
 Froude, James A., quoted, 422, 423-430; 431-438; 440, 453
 Gaelic, 238
 Galileo, 324, 480
 Games, Grecian, 77-78
 Gardiner, Stephen, 424, 425
 Garstang, Dr. John, 44
 Gaul, 144, 154, 155, 163, 177, 185, 200, 201, 220, 221, 225, 229
 Gaunt, John of, 273, 274
 Gaza, 31, 143
 Geiseric (Genserik) 199
 Geneva, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361
 Genoa, 305
 Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, 256, 258
 Germans, 194, 225, 235
 Germany, 72, 193, 198, 201, 230, 233, 292, 293, 320, 322, 340, 344, 396, 397, 404, 405, 406
 Germany in the Sixteenth Century, 333-335
 Germany, The Reformation in, 336-355
 Ghent, 305, 378, 381, 392, 396
 Ghiberti, 328
 Gibbon, Edward, 186, quoted: 193-205; 214-220
 Gildas, quoted, 238-240; 243
 Gilgames, 22, 23, 49, 55
 Giotto, 327
 Gizah, 8, 23
 Goethe, 388
 Good Hope, Cape of, 305, 306, 307
 Gordium (the Gordian knot) 142-143
 Goshen, 34
 Goths, 193-203
 Glotz, Dr., quoted, 73, 74
 Gracchus, Gaius, 175-176, 177, 180
 Gracchus, Tiberius, 174-175, 176
 Granikus, 143
 Granvelle, Cardinal, 386, 387, 389
 Great Wall of China, 193
 Grecian games, 77-78
 Greece, 73, 76-145, 163
 Greek, manuscripts, 313, 315
 Greeks, 70, 72, 74, 75, 331
 Green, John Richard, quoted: 242-250; 251-253; 255-276; 407-422; 431, 438-440; 441-453; 453-488
 Gregory I (the Great) 243, 244
 Gregory VII, Pope, 213, 333
 Gregory of Tours, 222, 223, 224
 Grey, Lady Jane, 421-423, 433
 Grey Friars, 470
 Grote, George, quoted: 76-119; 122-125; 131-145
 Guises, The, 362, 363, 364, 365, 367, 368, 369, 371, 372, 375, 433, 435
 Guizot, Francois Pierre Guillaume, quoted: 221-235; 250-251; 283-284; 296-302; 362-377
 Gunpowder, 237, 285, 287, 412
 Gustavus Adolphus, 402, 403, 404, 405
 Gutenberg, 321-322
 Guthrigern (Vortigern) 239
 Haarlem, 322, 395, 396
 Hadrian, 192, 205
 Hakluyt, Richard, 305, 308-313
 Hallam, Henry, quoted: 277-278; 313, 314, 315, 321, 322
 Hamburg, 305
 Hammurabi (Khammurabi) 27-29, 30
 Hampden, John, 462, 464, 469, 471
 Hanging Gardens, 58
 Hannibal, 154-157
 Hanseatic League, 305
 Hapsburgs, 345, 380, 398, 400, 405, 406
 Harper, Robert Francis, quoted: 28-29
 Harvey, William, 324, 480
 Hastings, Battle of, 251
 Hatshopsitu, 11
 Hauser, Ludvig, quoted, 336-361; 396-407
 Haverfield, Dr. F. J. J., quoted, 238
 Hebrews (Israelites), 34-37, 56
 Hejira, The, 216, 220
 Hellas, 76, 77, 78, 94
 Hellen, 76, 77
 Hellenic, 76, 78, 123, 133, 137
 Hellespont (Dardanelles) 86, 87, 92, 93, 94, 96, 103, 104, 122, 142, 157
 Helots, Revolt of, 110
 Henry I, of England, 255-256; 264
 Henry II, of England, 258-260, 264
 Henry III, of England, 264-267

- Henry IV, V, VI, of England, 274, 276
 Henry VII, of England, 276, 412, 413, 433
 Henry VIII, of England, 311, 381, 413-420; 423, 456, 484
 Henry II, of France, 362, 363, 433, 435
 Henry III, of France, 362, 369, 370, 371, 372, 375
 Henry IV, of France (see Navarre) 375-377; 396, 398, 456, 461
 Henry IV, of Germany, 333
 Heralds sent to Athens and Sparta, 88
 Herculaneum, 192
 Hermanric the Goth, 194
 Herod, 206-207
 Herodotus, 80, 90, 93, 94
 Hesiod, 79
 Hieroglyphs, 2, 41, 45
 Hippas, 84
 Hiram, King of Tyre, 36
 Hissarlik, 72
 Hittites (Khatti) 16, 43-45, 47
 Holland, 241, 361, 377-396
 Holy Isle, (Lindisfarne) 246
 Homer, 72, 73, 79, 81, 118, 228, 316
 Honorius, 195, 197, 198
 Horace, 187
 Horn, Philip, Count of, 386, 388, 393
 Horus, 4, 5
 Hospitalers, 302
 Howard, Catherine, 419
 Huguenots, 361, 362-377
 Humanism, 337, 338, 342, 343
 Hundred Years' War, 269, 270-276
 Hungarians, 293, 294
 Huns, The, 193-194, 199
 Huss, John, 339, 343
 Hutten, Ulrich von, 343, 344
 Hyksos, The, 9, 10, 34
 Ilium (Troy) 94
 India, Ancient, 59, 62-63, 70
 Indies, 306, 307
 Indo-European, 43, 62
 Indulgences, 339, 340
 Indus, 62
 Inquisition, The, 382-386, 387, 388, 390, 391, 393, 394, 397, 427, 428, 449
 Ionian cities, 85, 86
 Iran (Persia) 56, 57, 64, 66
 Ireland, 245, 246
 Ironsides, Cromwell's, 472
 Isaiah, 37
 Isis, 2
 Islam, 217, 220, 225
 Isocrates, 124, 125, 419
 Israelites (Hebrews) 34-37, 56
 Italy, 145, 146, 147, 156, 157, 170, 172, 174, 175, 183, 184, 200, 203, 233, 320, 322, 328, 329, 331
 Jahveh (Jehovah) 34, 35, 56
 James de Vitry, 298, 299
 James Stuart, I, of England, 440, 453, 454, 456-461
 James Stuart, II, of England, 482, 483-487
 Japan, 306
 Jarrow, 246, 247
 Jeffreys, Chief-justice, 483, 484
 Jericho, 35
 Jerusalem, 31, 36, 37, 207, 208, 209, 210, 218, 287
 Jesuits, Order of the, 378, 397, 399, 448, 449
 Jesus of Nazareth, 208, 209, 210
 Jews, 34, 37, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 215, 296, 382
 Joan of Arc, 274-276
 John, King of England, 260, 261-264, 333
 John of Gaunt, 274
 John the Baptist, 207-208
 Johns, C. H. W. quoted, 51
 Judea, 36, 37, 206, 207
 Jugurtha, 177
 Juries, 258, 259
 Jusserand, J. A. A. J., 277
 Justin I, 202, 203, 204
 Justinian, 203-205, 215, 319
 Jutes, 240, 241, 242, 253
 Jutland, 240, 241, 242
 Ka, The, 5
 Karnak, 11, 14, 44
 Kelvin, Lord, V
 Kenilworth Castle, 446
 Kepler, 480
 Kilpatrick, Dr. W. T. quoted, III
 King Arthur, 240
 Kleisthenes (Cleisthenes) 84-85
 Knossos (Cnossos) 73, 74
 Knox, John, 359, 438
 Koran, The, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220
 Koldewey, Dr., K, 58
 Korcyra (Corcyra) 113, 117, 121

- Kunyunjik, 51, 55
 Lake-dwellers, VII
 Lancaster, House of, 274, 276
 Langton, Stephen, 262, 263
 Lares and Penates, 148
 La Rochelle, 375
 Latimer, Hugh, 427
 Latins, 146, 147, 176
 Latium, 146, 147
 Laud, William, 461, 466, 467, 468, 469
 Leo I (the Great) 199
 Leonidas, 97, 99, 100
 Lepidus, Marcus Aemilius, 187
 Leuktra, 132
 Leyden, 395, 396
 Lindisfarne, (Holy Isle) 246
 Livy, quoted, 154-157; 187
 Lollards, 378, 410, 420
 Lombards, 226
 London, Fire of, 481
 Long Parliament, The, 477
 Louis IX of France (Saint Louis) 285, 296
 Louis XIII of France, 404
 Louis XIV of France, 484, 485
 Louis, Count of Nassau, 386, 394
 Louvre, Museum of the, 27, 28
 Loyola, 328, 378
 Lubeck, 305
 Lucca, 318
 Luther, Martin, 326, 336-355, 380
 Lutterworth, 411
 Lutzen, 403, 404
 Lycurgus, 78, 81
 Lydia, 55, 67, 69, 78, 126
 Lysander, 123, 124, 125

 Maccabees, The, 37, 206
 Macedonia, 87, 94, 96, 104, 133, 134, 139, 142, 143, 145, 163, 187, 196, 210
 Magdeburg, 336
 Magellan, 307
 Magi, The, 65, 94
 Magna Carta, 263-264, 464
 Mahabharata, The, 63
 Mamertines, The, 152
 Mandeville, Sir John, 301, 302
 Man, Early, VII
 Mansfield, Count Ernst von, 402
 Mantinea, 133
 Marathon, 89-92
 Marco Polo, 301, 302
 Marcus Antonius (Mark Antony) 187
 Marcus Aurelius, 192, 211
 Mardonius, 86, 87, 88, 104, 105
 Marius, 177
 Marlowe, Christopher, 270
 Marston Moor, 472
 Mary of Modena, 318, 485
 Mary Tudor, 414, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423-432, 433, 434, 435
 Maspero, Sir Gaston, quoted: 1-16; 17-29; 30-33; 34-37; 38-42; 43-44; 46-55; 56-58; 64-71
 Massinissa, 158, 159
 Mathias of Austria, Emperor, 397, 398
 Matilda, 256, 257, 258
 Matthew of Paris, of St. Albans, 265-266
 Maximilian I, 345, 353
 Maximilian of Bavaria, Duke, 399
 Mayors of the Palace, 224, 225
 Mazarin Bible, 322
 Mecca, 214, 215, 216, 218
 Media, 55, 57, 64, 66, 86
 Medici, Catherine de, 362, 364, 365, 367, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 375
 Medici, Cosmo de, 314
 Medici, Lorenzo de, 328, 329, 330, 362
 Medina, 216
 Megiddo, 10, 31, 32
 Melancthon, 343, 344, 359
 Memphis, 5, 10, 52
 Mercenaries, 126
 Merivale, Charles, quoted, 186, 187, 188-192
 Merodach, 20, 27, 28, 52
 Merovingians, 222, 224
 Mesopotamia, 30
 Messina (modern Messina) 151, 152, 199
 Metz (Mentz) 406
 Michelet's Formulae, 325
 Michaud, Jean Francois, quoted, 287-296
 Midas, King, 143
 Middle Ages, 272, 277-287, 305, 315, 324, 337, 406, 407, 412, 446
 Milan, 193, 197, 212, 305, 313, 322
 Miletus, 86
 Miltiades, 90, 91
 Mithridates, 177
 Mitylene, 117
 Mohammed (Mahomet) 214-220, 287
 Mohammedans, 220, 225, 297, 298, 299

- Mohenjo-daro, 62
 Mommsen, Theodor, quoted, 146-154;
 157-186
 Monasteries, 213, 418, 429
 Monasticism, 213, 333
 Monfort, Simon de, 266-267, 268
 Mongolia, 59
 Mongols, 300
 Monmouth, Duke of, 483
 Moors, 220, 382
 More, Sir Thomas, 413, 416, 444
 Morton's Fork, 412
 Motley, John Lothrop, quoted, 378-395
 Mount Badon, 240, 243
 Mount Carmel, 31
 Mount Hymettus, 90
 Mount Lebanon, 38
 Mount Sinai, 34
 Mount Tabor, 31
 Munster, 406
 Mycale, 106
 Mycenae, 73

 Nantes, Edict of, 377, 484
 Naramsin, 54
 Naseby, 472
 Nassau, Count of, 386, 394
 Navarre, Henry of (later Henry IV of
 France) 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368
 Nearchus, 144
 Nebuchadnezzar, 37, 56, 57, 58
 Neolithic Age, VII
 Nero, 188-189, 190
 Netherlands, The, 321, 377-396
 Neustria, 225
 Nicias, 117, 119, 120, 121
 Nile, 1-4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 30, 39
 Nineveh, 46, 48, 51, 52, 54, 56, 57, 68
 Nippur, 27
 Nissa (Nish) 293, 294, 295
 Nordlingen, 405
 Norman Conquest, 249-256
 Normans, 305
 Normandy, 249, 258, 260, 261, 262, 271
 North Sea, 240, 241
 Northumbria, 244, 245, 246
 Norway, 247
 Nuremberg, 305, 348

 Ockham, William, 407
 Octavius, 187
 Odoacer, 199-201
 Oligarchs, 124, 184

 Olympia, 77
 Olympiads, 77
 Olympic games, 77, 97
 Olympus, Mount, 79, 94, 96
 Olynthus, 137
 Ommiades, The, 220
 Orange, William the Silent, Prince of,
 386, 387, 389, 390, 391, 394, 395, 396,
 398, 449
 Orange, William III, Prince of, 475, 485,
 486, 487, 488
 Osiris, 2, 5, 14, 34
 Ostracism, 85
 Oswald, 246
 Otto the Great, 233, 335
 Ovid, 187
 Oxenstierna, Count Axel, 404, 405
 Ozymandias (Shelley's sonnet) 58
 Oxford, 266, 267, 339, 407, 409, 410,
 411, 430, 447

 Pacification of Ghent, The, 392, 396
 Padua, 313, 318, 326
 Paleolithic Age, VII
 Palestine, 37, 163
 Pan-Hellenic Union, 95, 96, 106, 136
 Papacy, The, 262, 265, 333, 338, 339,
 345, 352, 353, 406, 407, 408, 416, 418,
 424, 425, 427, 432, 443, 447
 Paradises, 69
 Paris, 224, 301, 376, 407
 Parliament, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273,
 408, 412, 416, 418, 419, 424, 428, 432,
 433, 434, 440, 443, 448, 449, 450, 455,
 457, 458, 459, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465,
 466, 467, 468, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474,
 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 484,
 487, 488
 Parliament, The Good, 408
 Parliament, The Long, 470-472; 480
 Parliament of 1629, The, 466-467
 Parmenio, 143
 Parr, Catherine, 419
 Parma, Duchess of, 386, 387, 388, 390,
 391
 Paul (Saul) of Tarsus, 210, 314
 Pavia, 202
 Peasant Revolt, The 273-274
 Peasants' War, 349-350
 Peiraeus, 95, 105, 106, 111, 116, 122,
 196
 Peisistratus, 83-84

- Peloponnesians, 100, 104, 105, 107, 111,
 112, 114, 115, 132, 133, 137
 Peloponnesian Wars, 110-123
 Peloponnesus, 80, 117
 Pennsylvania, Excavations by the Uni-
 versity of, 20, 27
 Pentelikus, Mt., 90, 91
 Pepin, 225, 283
 Pepys, Samuel, 481, 482
 Pericles, 111, 114, 115, 118, 136, 181
 Persepolis, 65, 68
 Persia, 16, 56, 64-71, 126, 145
 Persian war against Greece, 85-104
 Peter the Hermit, 289, 292-296
 Petition of Right, 457: 464-466, 468,
 469
 Petrarch, 315, 316, 319
 Phalerum, 91, 95, 101, 104
 Pharsalus, 180
 Pheidippides, 89
 Phidias, 112
 Philip II of Spain, 376, 378, 380, 381,
 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 393, 394-
 396, 406, 424, 426, 427, 428, 429, 431,
 432, 433, 435, 438, 443, 449, 450, 453
 Philip II of France, 259, 261, 263, 296
 Philip VI of France, 270, 271
 Philip of Macedonia, 134-138, 139, 140
 Philippi, 140, 187, 210
 Phoenicia, 38, 39, 144
 Phoenicians, 38-42, 108, 150, 154, 158,
 159, 162
 Picts and Scots, 238, 239
 Pilate, Pontius, 189, 207
 Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar) 157
 Pindar, 142
 Pizarro, 307
 Plague in Athens, 115-117;
 in England, 271, 272; 481
 Plantagenets, The, 256, 258-276
 Plantagenet, Geoffrey, 256, 258, 259
 Platea, 89, 104, 105, 106, 107
 Plato, 112, 119, 125, quoted: 128-131;
 316
 Pliny, 190-192, 211, 285
 Plutarch, 81, 82
 Pole, Cardinal Reginald, 425, 427, 429,
 430, 431
 Polybius, 160
 Pompeii, 192
 Pompey, 177, 178, 187
 Pope Adrian VI, 348
 Pope Alexander VI, 329, 330, 382
 Pope Clement VII, 415, 417, 429
 Pope Innocent III, 362
 Pope Innocent VIII, 340
 Pope Julius II, 340
 Pope Leo III, 229
 Pope Leo X, 341
 Pope Martin V, 339
 Pope Urban II, 290
 Pope, Title of, 212, 213, 333
 Portuguese, 305, 306, 307, 308
 Prague, Insurrection at, 397-398
 Praxiteles, 112
 Pre-Greeks, 73-75
 Presbyterians, 361
 Pride's Purge, 473, 475
 Printing, 321-323, 379
 Procopius, 204
 Prohibition, 218
 Protestant, Origin of word, 351
 Protestant persecution of Catholics,
 365, 447, 448, 449
Protestant Union, The, 397
 Psalms, The, 36
 Ptah, 5, 34
 Ptolemies, 187, 207
 Publican, 164, 208
 Puni (Phoenicians) 150, 151
 Punic Wars, 150-163, 166
 Puritans, 361, 438, 456, 457, 461, 467,
 472, 479, 480, 481
 Purple, Tyrian, 40-41
 Pym, John, 458, 462, 464-465, 470, 471
 Pyramid, The Great, 8, 9
 Pyrrhus of Epirus, 147
 Qodshu, 10, 32, 38
 Queen of Scots (See Stuart, Mary)
Quinte Essence, Book of 282-283
 Quintilian, 321
Quo Vadis, 189
 Ra, 34
 Ramses, I, 14
 Ramses II, 15, 16, 34, 43, 44, 46
 Ramayana, The, 63
 Raphael, 330
 Raschid, Haroun al, 287
 Ravenna, 197, 198, 201, 203
 Rawlinson, Sir Henry, 22, 68
 Reggio, 318
 Regicide Judges, 481
 Reform, Attempts at in Rome, 173-186
 Reformation, The Period of, 333-411

- Remusat, Jean Pierre Abel, quoted by Guizot, 300-302
 Renaissance, The, 277-332, 333
 Restoration, The, 479, 480
 Revival of Art, 331-332
 Revival of Learning, 313-332, 413
 Revolution of 1688, The Bloodless, 488
 Rheims, 223, 275
 Richard I (Coeur de Lion) of England, 259, 260-261
 Richard II, of England, 273, 274
 Richard III, of England, 276
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 404, 405, 407
 Ridley, Nicholas, 427
 Rig-Veda, 62, 63
 Rizzio, 439
 Road from Egypt to the Euphrates, 10, 30-32
 Robert the Devil, 250
 Robertson, William, quoted: 333-335
 Roland, Song of, 228-229, 251
 Rolf (Rollo), 249, 250
 Roman amusements, 167-168
 Roman Britain, 238, 239
 Roman commerce, 149, 170-171
 Roman Empire, 186, 193, 333
 Roman gods, 80, 148
 Roman luxury, 168-170, 184
 Roman monarchy, 147
 Roman problems and attempts at reform, 163-186
 Roman provinces, government of, 163-164
 Roman Republic, 147-186
 Romans, 78, 144
 Rome, 116, 146-205, 206, 210, 313, 322, 338
 Rome, Fall of, 199-201
 Rome, government in, 164-166, 183
 Rome, invaded by the Goths, 193-203
 Romulus and Remus, 147
 Roncesvalles, 228
 Roses, Wars of the, 276, 471
 Rosetta Stone, The, 2
 Roundheads, 472
 Rubicon, The, 177, 178
 Rudolph II, Emperor, 397
 Rudyard, Sir Benjamin, 461
 Runnymede, 263
 Saint Bartholomew's Day, Massacre of, 365-375, 447
 Saint Basil, 213
 Saint Benedict, 213
 Saint Bernard, 296, 302
 Saint Chad, 246
 Saint Francis of Assisi, 213
 Saint Gall, 321, 356
 Saint Louis (IX of France) 285, 296
 Saint Matthew of St. Albans, 265-266
 Saint Patrick, 238
 Saint Simeon Stylites, 213
 Saint Thomas Aquinas, 285
 Salamis, 100-104, 105, 114
 Samarcand, 220
 Sanhedrim, 209
 Saqqara (Sakkara) 8, 23
 Saracens (Mohammedans) 277, 287, 291, 317
 Sardis, 69, 86, 92, 93, 94, 96, 126
 Sargon I, 27, 43, 54
 Sargon II, 37, 48-50, 68
 Saul, King, 36
 Saul (Paul) of Tarsus, 210
 Savonarola, 326-330
 Saxons, 226, 240, 241, 242, 243, 253
 Sayce, A. H., quoted: 27, 48
 Scandinavian States, 396
 Schliemann, Heinrich, 72, 73
 Schmalkald, League of, 355
 Scholasticism, 284-286
 School of the Palace, Lesson in, 283-284
 Schools, 231, 421
 Scipio Aemilianus, 161, 162, 163, 182
 Scipio, Publius Cornelius Africanus, 157, 174, 175
 Scotland, 269, 270
 Scylax, 70
 Scylla and Charybdis, 199
 Seals, Babylonian, 23, 26, 62
 Sedgemoor, 483
 Semites, 17, 18, 34, 41, 59, 150
 Semlin, 294
 Sennacherib, 37, 50-51, 53, 56
 Septuagint, The, 207
 Serfdom, 272, 274
 Serverus, 360
 Seti I, 14, 15
 Seymour, Jane, 419, 420
 Shelley's sonnet, Ozymandias, 58
 Sicilian Expedition, The, 118-121, 123
 Sicily, 144, 151, 152, 153, 154, 163, 172, 173, 185, 199

- Sidney, Sir Philip, 309
 Sidon, 38, 39, 41, 151
 Sienkiewicz, Henryk, 189
 Simon de Montfort, 266-267, 268
 Sirbonis, Lake of, 30, 31
 Slavery, 23, 24, 82, 110, 149, 171-173, 183, 200
 Socrates, 112, 119, 128-131, 132
 Solar system, V
 Solomon, King, 36, 37
 Solon, 81-83, 84, 85
 Solemn Remonstrance, The, 471, 472
 Sophocles, 112, 125, 419
 Spain, 182, 200, 415, 435, 449, 462
 Spanish League, 376
 Sparta, 80, 81, 88, 89, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 132, 133, 137, 140
 Sparta, Leonidas, King of, 97, 99
 Spire, Diet and Edict of, 350, 351-352
 Star-Chamber, 456, 468, 471
 Stephen, King of England, 256, 257, 258
 Stephen, The stoning of, 209, 210
 Stilicho, 196, 197, 198
 Stone Ages, VII
 Stonehenge, 238
 Strafford, Earl of, 468, 469, 470
 Strasburg, 406
 Stuarts (See Charles I, and II and James I and II)
 Stuart, Henry, Lord Darnley, 438, 439, 442
 Stuart, Mary, Queen of Scots, 433, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 449, 450
 Sulla, 177, 178, 180, 185
 Sully, Duke of, 374, 375
 Sumer, 28
 Sumerians, 17, 18, 62
 Susa, 28, 69
 Sweden, 247, 396, 403, 404, 405, 406, 434
 Switzerland, 320, 356-361, 406
 Syene, 3
 Syllogisms, 285
 Symonds, John Addington, quoted: 313, 314, 315-321; 322-332
 Syracuse, 121, 123, 151, 152
 Syria, 10, 11, 12, 18, 25, 30-33, 39, 52, 55, 56, 70, 163, 170, 172, 207, 288
 Tacitus, 189, 211
 Taillefer, 251
 Taine, Hippolyte A., quoted: 240-242
 Tarquins, The, 147
 Tarsus, 126
 Tasso, 296
 Tell-el-Amarna, 12, 34, 43
 Telloh, 18
 Tempe, Pass of, 96, 97
 Templars, 302
 Ten Thousand, Retreat of The, 126-128
 Tetzl, John, 339, 340
 Teutons, 194, 221, 222, 225, 229, 240, 242, 245, 253, 409
 Thapsus, 178
 Thebes (Egypt) 2, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 53
 Thebes (Greece) 80, 131-133, 134, 140, 141, 142, 196
 Themistocles, 94, 95, 96, 101, 102, 105, 108, 119
 Theodoric, 201-203
 Thermopylae, 76, 77, 97-100, 134, 135, 137, 138, 141, 196
 Thirty, Rule of The, 123-125
 Thirty Years' Truce, 112-114
 Thirty Years' War, 396-407
 Thomas a Becket, 258
 Thucydides, 80, 84, 109, 114, 116, quoted: 119-122; 136
 Thutmosis I, 9-11
 Thutmosis III, 11, 43, 46
 Tiber, 146, 147
 Tiberius Caesar, 188, 189
 Tibet, 59
 Tiglath-pileser III, 48, 67
 Tigris, 18, 46, 51, 57
 Tii, 12
 Tilly, Count of, 402
 Tiryns, 73
 Titus, 189, 190-192, 210
 Torquemada, 382
 Tours, 225
 Toul, 406
 Trajan, 192, 210, 211
 Trasimene, Lake, 157
 Treaty of peace, Most ancient, 43-44
 Trent, Council of, 355, 397
 Tribonian, 205
 Triumvirate, 187
 Troy (Ilium) 72, 73, 94, 142
 Troyes, Treaty of, 274
 Tudors, 276, 412-455
 Tunis, 151, 160
 Tutankhamon (King Tut) 13

- Tylor, Dr. E. B. quoted VI
 Tyndale, William, 413
 Tyre, 38, 39, 40, 41, 143, 151, 170
 Tyrian dye, 40-41
 Ulfilas, 194
 Union, Greek, 95
 Universe, V
 Universities, 313, 317-318
 Ur (Uru) 18, 19, 20, 34
 Usher, Archbishop, VI
 Utica (near Carthage) 160, 161
 Utrecht, Treaty of, 396
 Valdarno, 327
 Valens, 193, 194, 195
 Valois, Marguerite de, 359, 363, 365,
 366, 368, 372
 Vandals, 204
 Van Loon, Hendrik, quoted, 302-305
 Vedic Hymns, 62, 63
 Venice, 197, 199, 305, 306, 313, 322
 Verdun, 406
 Verona, 201
 Vesalius, 324
 Vespasian, 189, 190, 210
 Vespucci, Amerigo, 307
 Vesuvius, 190, 192
 Vienna, 353
 Virgil, 187
 Vortigern (Guthrigern) 239
 Waldenses, 362, 378
 Wales, 267-268
 Wallace William, 269
 Wallenstein, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404
 Walls, around the Peiraeus, 105, 106,
 123
 Walls, The Long, 111, 123, 126
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, 450
 Walter the Penniless, 293
 Warwick, Earl of, 420, 421, 464
 Wat Tyler's Rebellion, 408
 Wedmore, Peace of, 249
 Weigall, A. E. P., 12
 Wells, Mr. H. G. quoted, V
 Wentworth, Thomas, 458
 Westphalia, Treaty of, 396, 405-407
 Whitby, 246
 William and Mary, 485, 486, 487, 488
 William of Tyre, 291, 298, 299
 William the Conqueror, 250-255
 Wittenberg, University of, 337, 338,
 342, 344, 345
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 414, 415, 416
 Worms, Diet and Edict of, 345-347, 348,
 351
 Wyclif, John, 339, 407-411
 Xenophon, 119, 122, quoted: 126-128
 Xerxes, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102,
 103, 104
 York, House of, 276
 Zama, 157, 174
 Ziggurats, 19, 50
 Zodiac, 20
 Zoroaster, 64, 65
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 356

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



140 723

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY